A

DISPUTATION

Between a

DOCTOR

And an

Apothecary:

OR A

REPLY to the NEW ARGUMENT of

Dr. *R. Burthogge*, M. D.

FOR

Infants Baptism;

Wherein the Novelty in which it glories, is justly censured, and its Harmony proved to be no better than self Repugnancy, and a manifest abuse of Scripture.

By *Philip Cary*, a neighbouring Apothecary, a lover of Truth and Peace.

Prov. 18. 17. *He that is first in his own Cause, seemeth just; but his* Neighbour *cometh and searcheth him.*

LONDON, Printed by *B. W.* for the Author, and are to be sold by *R. Baldwin.* 1684.

1684
C333

THE EPISTLE TO THE READER.

I Am ſenſible my Title page needs an Epiſtle Apologetick, leſt it ſhould ſeem either Romantick, or ridiculous. But let it not be cenſured as imprudent in this learned Doctor to meaſure Weapons with an unskilful Apothecary; nor preſumptuous in me to enter the Liſts, and draw my ſhort Dagger upon this Learned Man. It is true, the Doctor with whom I

combate, is of a ſingular acumen, commanding eloquence, and great prudence: But yet nevertheleſs, it may not ſeem any more a ſlide or errour in his prudentials in chuſing me for his Antagoniſt, who am every way ſo much his inferior, than it was a defect in that rare Limner's skill, who to give the Picture of the late Queen a comparative addition of ſtature, drew her Dwarf by her ſide, booted, ſpurred, and ſworded, with her Hand ſtraining down to reach the crown of his Head. Which being duly conſidered, you will have the leſs reaſon to cenſure the Doctor as impolitick in his choice of ſuch an one as I am, to be his Combatant. But yet leſt the diſparity ſhould

ſeem

seem too great, he hath thought fit however to tell the Reader in p. 18. of his Epistle, 'That he 'does not apprehend it any dis-'grace (*as some would have it*) 'to have been ingaged with me, 'for that I am a careful, painful, 'and industrious searching person, 'much conversant in the present 'Controversie; and (*as he believes*) 'can say as much for my Persua-'sion, as any other whatsoever. *So that I hope, enough is said in a few words, to salve the reputation of my Adversaries prudence in his choice.*

A Word or two more is but necessary to obviate thy censure of my presumption in entring the Lists with this Learned Man, whose fame hath more than once

been reſounded from the Preſs. And all that I have to ſay for my ſelf is this, It was not choice but neceſſity that hath drawn me in. I was attacked by the Doctor with this New Argument, both in Front, Flank, and Rear, with ſo much briskneſs in a private Diſpute; that I confeſs I was quite overborn, as well with the ſurprizing novelty of the Argument, as with the rapid ſtream of his irreſiſtable eloquence; leaving him a fair Field: So that it was with me for ſome time, as with the ſilly Froggs in the Fable, who were all ſtruck into ſilence and amazement, by the Log thrown down by Jupiter *among them; till at laſt not perceiving it move, they crawled*

led nearer to it, and perceiving it to be a senseless thing which had so affrighted them; they grew bold enough to hop without fear upon it, and over it, and round about it. Thus it fared with me, who stood a while like a man astonished, at this uncouth Argument; but coming nearer to it, I found it as meer a Log, as that was: and not cast only at me, but at all those that are the Advocates and Asserters of Infants Baptism also: (all others, but himself, as he affirms, hanging it on Wyres, or by Geometry only:) Upon this I rouzed up my courage; and having undertook the Doctor in several private Letters that had past to and fro betwixt us; though I never thought to have

have made the matter more publick; yet the Doctor having been pleased to print his own Letters, and that by themselves, I am thereby necessitated as well as incouraged, to follow and attend his motions, according to the duty of my place.

If I seem to be defective in that deference I owe him, or too smart in any part of my reply, I beseech thee before I come under thy censure, to read those passages in the Doctor which gave the occasion; and see whether my words be above the value of the provoking cause? If thou be a competent and equal Judge, I dare refer my self wholly to thee, whether the Doctor hath not with equal absurdity, in the Book I

here deal with, made Abraham *the Repreſentative of the Carnal Seed, included Baptiſm in the* 17. *of* Gen. *and excluded the firſt and grand Covenant-Promiſe out of* Gen. 3. 15. *'Tis to me aſtoniſhing that ſo clear and piercing an Eye ſhould ſee a Command for Infants Baptiſm in Gen.* 17. *and not to be able to diſcern the Covenant of Grace in* Gen. 3.15. *his notion concerning the latter of which, you will find p.* 110. *of his preſent Diſcourſe; where he is pleaſed to tell me, 'That the 'Words in the laſt mentioned 'Scripture, were not told (as 'I had expreſſed it) to* Adam, *'but to the Serpent, as being 'ſpoken not by way of Promiſe to 'the one, but of denunciation of*

'a

'a Sentence on the other; with much more to the same purpose: the introduction whereof you will find at p. 99.

If I seem to be concerned above the rate of my ordinary temper, (the case standing as it doth) it is zeal for the abused Word of God that hath warmed me. I am conscious of no prejudice towards the person of the Author; neither do I love to draw the Saw of contention with any man, much less with one that is so much my superior: But necessity will make Cowards fight. Necessity (as the Doctor well knows) will make a man do greater things than this: It will at least excuse me from presumption in respect of the present Combate.

bate. But it is very probable, the Doctor may meet with rougher hands than mine in this Controversie; all sorts of persons being concerned in it, as that which bears hard upon them, and is like accordingly to be resented by them. I honour his person, whilst I detect and censure his errours, and abuses of the Scriptures. I daily pray for the desirable unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; and rest

Thine in all
Christian Service
and Affection,

Philip Cary.

Animadverſions, and Reflections, upon a late Diſcourſe of the Acute and Learned Dr. Richard Burthogge, *M. D. againſt a neighbouring Apothecary, Entitled as followeth,*

Doctor.

'AN Argument for Infants Baptiſm, deduced from the Analogy of Faith, and Harmony of the Scriptures. In which in a method wholly New, and upon Grounds not commonly obſerved, both the Doctrine (of Infants Baptiſm) is fully aſſerted, and the Objections againſt it are obviated.

Apothecary.

Apothecary.

Analogy and *Harmony* are Words of a taking ſound, and delicious Air, melodiouſly chiming in the Readers attention. But it is not very probable, that that Diſcourſe ſhould deſerve ſo pompous a title, which abounds with ſelf repugnancies, and contradictions. To give the Reader a taſte, and but a taſte of this harmonical Diſcourſe. In his Epiſtle to the Reader, p. 18. he ſaith: 'The 'Point in controverſy is not a point 'of human learning: Here (for the 'main) is no need of Greek, or 'Hebrew, or of the ſubtleties of the 'Schoolmen, or of *exactneſs of Criti-'ciſm.* Analogically and Harmonically whereunto he delivers himſelf, and that upon the main Point, and very Hinge of the Controverſy in theſe Words, *p.* 88. 'If you ſay I 'am too *Critical*; I ſay, this is a Text 'that muſt be underſtood *Critically.* 'The Apoſtle was as *critical* upon it 'as I, or any Man can be, when he 'obſerved, it is ſaid *Seed*, as ſpeaking 'of one, and not *Seeds*: and what he 'ſaith,

'ſaith, is the proper Key to unlock 'the Text.

In his Epiſtle, *p.* 5. he tells us, 'He was concerned to ſee an Article 'of that importance, as Infants Bap-'tiſm is, to hang on *Wyres* only, 'and by *Geometry*. And that he 'could not ſee it owner of *ſure* 'and *ſolid* foundations, unleſs it be as 'he here layes it. Harmonical with which (if that be to Harmonize) is what he ſaith, *p.* 79. 'Where he high-'ly applauds Mr. *Baxter*'s Argu-'ments as abundantly proving the 'Church Memberſhip of Infants. The *Wyres* then on which Mr. *Baxter* hang'd it, were it ſeems a *ſolid* Foun-dation, or elſe an *abundant proof* is none.

In *p.* 122. 'He calls my Opinion, 'an upſtart Opinion, or Novelty; 'not of above an Age or Century. In Harmony wherewith if that be ſo, he ſaith to this purpoſe, *p.* 74. 'That 'tis probable thoſe that would not 'ſuffer little Children to come to 'Chriſt, were of *my Perſwaſion*. If ſo, my Opinion, according to the Doctors own Conceſſion, is no late, upſtart opinion.

Having

Having done with the *Harmony*; I ſhall next reflect upon the *Novelty* of the Doctor's Argument. 'Where-'in (ſaith the Doctor) *in a Method* 'wholly new. New, and wholly New, are Charms as powerful, as *Analogy* and *Harmony*. 'Tis the nature of Man, ſaith *Seneca*, *magis nova quam magna mirari*, to admire things *new*, rather than *great* and *worthy*, But I muſt tell you, Doctor, that *Innovators* hear not well among the Judicious. And that of all Men you ſhould not ſcoff at *New-light*, as you do without cauſe in many parts of your Diſcourſe. You have bleſſed the World with a new Light, if your Argument have as much of weight, as your Title Page and Epiſtles have of Pomp and Oſtentation. A Light which will alter many received Schemes, as you ſay, Epiſtle, *p.* 19. But how alter many? why not all? If your Argument be *wholly new*, and the Doctrine of Infants Baptiſm hanged before but upon *Wyres*, and by *Geometry*, as you ſay; it muſt alter *All* the former Schemes. And this being the *only ſolid* Foundation, it alters them *deſervedly*. For why ſhould

ſo

ſo great an Article as Infants Baptiſm hang any longer by *Geometry*, as *Mahomet*'s Tomb at *Mecca* is ſaid to do? When you have laid a *ſolid* Foundation for it, 'tis fit it ſhould ſtand upon its *own Baſis* hereafter.

This is a bold attempt, a brave Word for the Cauſe you mannage; brave indeed, if it ſucceed well, and that you convince the learned World by it, That all former Aſſertors and Champions of Infant Baptiſm did but *Wyre-draw* the Scriptures, and hanged all by *Geometry*. But I muſt here mind you, That the *Licians* ſuffered none to propoſe a new Law, but at his own peril; that if the Reaſon thereof were not approved, he that offered it might pay for the novelty. The Church of *England*, together with *all* the Advocates and Aſſerters of Infants Baptiſm, are more concerned in this paſſage than my ſelf. Let them look to the *old Foundations*, I am principally (at preſent at leaſt) concerned about this *New one*; wherein I fight, and indeed can fight againſt no other Party, or Perſon in the World but Dr. *Burthogge*;

thogge; ſeeing I now oppoſe that which no man ever urged, or aſſerted beſide, or before himſelf; which is a good Breaſt-work for my ſecurity againſt all other adverſaries. Indeed you have choſen a *New ground* to fight upon, not ſo much with ſuch a Poultron as I am; but all the learned that will ſtand by their *old Arguments*.

And thus, Sir, you have ſtrawed the Readers way with flowers of Rhetorick, and charmed his ears with melodious ſounds, *New* and *wholly New*; and *not commonly obſerved*. Certainly this is every mans Money; and I am confident would be ſo, if your Book-ſeller Mr. *Jonathan Greenwood*'s Shop at the Crown in the *Poultry*, did but ſtand over againſt the *New-Exchange* at *Athens*; if it be not *New*, none will regard it: and if not *wholly New*, ſome body would ſhare ſtakes with you, when you come to divide the ſpoils in the Field of Victory. And Social glory is but an half-Mooned honour. All or None is the game for him that aſpires to the reputation of a Non-ſuch.

Editor.

Doctor.

'The Argument I go upon, as I do 'mannage it, is not common; and 'hath little Authority to make it good, 'beſide that of ſound Reaſon, 'good Senſe, and Scripture Har-'mony. *Epiſtle to the Reader*, p. 5

Apothecary.

That it is not common, as you do mannage it, is undeniable: And that it hath little Authority to make it good, beſides ſound Reaſon, good Senſe, and Scripture Harmony; you voluntarily confeſs: And indeed if it have theſe three Vouchers, it hath enough. I value not other Authorities that ſhall come after theſe, more than ſupernumeraries, or a caſt upon the full meaſure, *ex abundanti*. But then your three Vouchers muſt ſpeak home to the point in plain and intelligible words: for ſhould theſe fail you too (as I am much of the mind they will) you are then by your own acknowledgment, left utterly alone. And *Wo to him* (ſaith *Solomon*) *that*

it

is alone: Thoſe that err with a multitude of learned and grave Men, will ſcape better in the crowd, than he that ſtands ſingle and naked, as you do.

But, Sir, if your Argument be wholly *New*, and the only *ſolid* Foundation of the great Article of Infants Baptiſm; all others hanging it upon *Wyres*, and by *Geometry*, as you ſpeak; And that yours be (as here you add) ſupported by ſound Reaſons, good Senſe, and Scripture Harmony: ſuch a poor ſmatterer in Logick as I am, would be apt to inferr, That certainly all the old Schemes which it alters, muſt needs be irrational, nonſenſical, and confuſed: For I ſhould think, ſound Reaſon removes, or alters nothing but what is ſo far irrational, as it alters it; and good Senſe nothing but what is Nonſenſical; nor Harmony any thing but what is confuſed and jarring: For my Natural Logick teacheth me that Senſe fights not with Senſe, but Nonſenſe; Reaſon oppoſes not Reaſon, but what is Unreaſonable; and Harmony nothing but Confuſion and Diſorder. And verily, Sir, 'tis matter of admiration to me,

me, and I believe will be ſo to your Readers, how all the Senſe, Reaſon and Harmony came to be center'd within the compaſs of *your Pericranium*; and that in ſo ſearching and critical an Age, and in ſo celebrated, and long bandied a Controverſie as this, no Man ſhould be ſo fortunate, to light upon the ſolid grounds of ſound Reaſon, good Senſe, and Scripture Harmony, before or beſides your ſelf.

Doctor.

'To the Queſtion, How I came to 'hit upon it? *Epiſtle. &c. p. 5.*

Apothecary.

You have ſeaſonably anticipated me, I was juſt going to put the Queſtion, What benevolent, and auſpicious Star guided you to this New Diſcovery? We know that little circumſtances are noted by *Hiſtorians*, as moſt memorable and famous things, by which the renowned Adventurers, ſuch as *Columbus*, *Drake*, *&c.* were firſt guided to, or incouraged in their New

New Diſcoveries. You may therefore well imagine (as you here do) that upon your firſt diſcovery of this *Terra Nova*, all the amazed and admiring crowd would ſoon ſurround you, and even tire you with this Queſtion, *How you came to hit upon it?*

How you did I do not know; for my part I have viewed the Text, *Gen.* 17. 9. where your New Diſcovery is ſaid to be, with the beſt Eyes I have, and can ſee nothing more than what the old, ſolid Interpreters (that travel'd and ſearcht that ſpot, before you or I were born) have already diſcovered. And I am ſure they tell us of no ſuch Senſe as yours; no not a Man of them, as your ſelf confeſs. It is juſtly therefore a wonder to me, *How you came to hit upon it?* and it was very ſeaſonable to put it in the place where you did: for certainly, it is a Queſtion hanging by *Geometry* upon the lip of every man that reads you.

Iſaac asked *Jacob* juſt ſuch another Queſtion, concerning his Veniſon: *How cameſt thou by it ſo ſoon my Son?* and he ſaid, *the Lord brought it to me.* 'Tis like there is as much ſincerity in your

your Anſwer, as in *Jacob*'s: And I believe there is. You inſinuate that you were concerned to ſee ſuch an Article as Infant-Baptiſm hang but upon *Wyres*, and therefore ſought for a better; and at laſt found it, or digged it out of the Quarry of ſound Reaſon, good Senſe, and Scripture Harmony; and ſo challenge the honour of the firſt Diſcoverer: *Ego primus inveni*, is no common badge of honour in my opinion; it is no great matter who firſt found it, but whether it be worth the finding.

Doctor.

'I take it to have been a piece of 'vanity in him (ſpeaking of his pre- 'ſent adverſary) to tell me as he doth '(that, as he remembred, one of the 'Schoolmen ſaid, *&c.*) Becauſe I 'have reaſon to believe he under- 'ſtands the Schoolmen, as little as 'Greek or Hebrew. *Epiſt.* p. 17.

Apothecary.

The paſſage I referred to in the Schoolmen, is very intelligible by any

any man that was never skilled in the learned Languages, as well as by your ſelf; whoſe skill I hope is greater in the Tongues, than it appears to be in the interpretation of Scriptures. They ſay, *That if the Workmans hand were his Rule, he could never err in working:* I applyed it by ſaying, That if your Gloſſes and Interpretations be as authentick as the Text, you can never err in the Interpretation: Did this grate? I fear many paſſages will grate more (though in none I deſign your exaſperation) before you and I have ended. Did I deſerve to be called *John Duns* his Scholar for this? I had it not from *John Duns* (alias *Scotus*:) though if I had, I may as well ſay, He was a dunce without *dulneſs*; as one ſomewhere calls *Naaman*'s ſin, a ſin without *guilt*. It is not the firſt time a pleaſant fancy hath ſported with the name of *John Duns*; nor the firſt time it hath been well repayed for ſuch wanton ſport. This ſubtle Doctor was once ſitting at Table with *Charles* the *bald*, Emperor and King of *France*; and behaving himſelf a little ruſtically and homely, as I do with you, the Emperor jeſtingly asked

asked him, *Quid intereſt inter Scotum & Sotum?* What is between a *Scot* and a Sot? He Anſwered, *Menſa*, the Table. I dare not be ſo vain to ſay turn the Table with the ſtory: no, no; I acknowledge you a man of parts; every way my ſuperior; being not worthy the name of *John Duns* or Dr. *Burthogge's* Scholar: But you ſee the greateſt men, even Emperors, as well as your ſelf, cannot ſo ſport with impunity.

Doctor.

You conclude to the Reader thus; *Epiſt.* p. *ult.*
'That you are much confirmed in the
'Grounds you have laid as to the ve-
'rity of them, by their undergoing *one*
'kind of *Teſt*, without any loſs; yet
'before you advance them from be-
'ing points of meer *Opinion*, to be
'points of ſome degree of *Faith*,
'you are willing they ſhould undergo
'*all others*.

Apothecary.

'Tis unaccountable how ſo learned, acute, and perſpicacious a man as you,

you, who have altered all Schemes that the learned of the Age have drawn, in reference to Infants Baptiſm, and adventured to call them *Wyres*, and *Geometry*, ſhould be capable of *Confirmation*, from ſuch an illiterate, ſoft-headed Dunce, as you repreſent me in theſe your Letters to be. What can I add to you? but to be *confirmed*: Ai, and *much confirmed* in thoſe your very *Grounds*, by their undergoing *my Teſt*; ſeems to be not only a *plaiſter* to heal my ſoft pate, which you have often broken; but ſuch a *Crown* put upon it as I am aſhamed to wear.

But whether your Dictates have paſſed *my Teſt* without *any loſs*, belongs properly to the Reader to judge. 'Tis poſſible he may think you have loſt your deſign, your own, and his underſtanding too, if he have but patience to trace you through your intricate, involved, and myſtical interpretations and Paraphraſes.

However this is a commendable ſtrain of modeſty; 'That before you 'advance them from being Points of 'meer Opinion, to be Points of ſome 'degree of Faith, you are willing they

'they ſhould undergo all others. It ſeems then, all that you have ſo confidently argued for, and concluded in theſe Letters, is not yet in the leaſt degree a Point of your *Faith*, but meer opinion. That's modeſtly inſinuated, like a Man conſcious of his liableneſs to miſtakes; and that his *own* Argument may hang upon *Wyres*, and by *Geometry*, as well as *other mens*: But then I am ſtumbled as much at the back-door of your Epiſtle, as I was at the fore-door of your gawdy Title page; for I muſt ingenuouſly acknowledge, I do not underſtand, How the conſent or approbation of your Readers, is capable to advance your Argument, from being a meer Opinion to ſome degree of Faith: for ſhould they all approve, and applaud it; (which I am perſwaded few will do) yet when all is done; your Faith relying upon *humane* Grounds, could be advanced no higher than to a *humane* Faith: except you ultimately reſolve it into your Readers Judgment, as the Papiſts do theirs into that of the Church.

And thus much for your ſplendid Title page, and charming Epiſtle; I now come to your Letters; the occaſion whereof you thus hint at, and but hint, in your firſt page.

Doctor.

Dear Sir,

'I cannot believe my ſelf obliged 'by the occaſional Diſcourſe (which 'I held almoſt a year and three 'quarters agoe) about Infants Bap-'tiſm, to engage any further in that 'controverſie.

Apothecary.

It would ſcarce be worth the Readers time to be informed of the nativity of this Controverſie betwixt us, were it not to undeceive him, if he take me (as who that reads your Letter but would) for the firſt aggreſſor: I will be ſhort and plain. The occaſion was thus, A Gentleman in the Neighbourhood lying ſick, the Doctor was ſent for to adminiſter to him; and I was then alſo

alſo obliged to attend him; The Doctor being an active, diſcurſive perſon, was pleaſed, if not for paſtime, yet at leaſt to gratifie the company (amongſt which the Lady to whom he dedicates it, was one of the chief) to provoke me to diſpute the point of Infant Baptiſm with him: I declined ſeveral times the Ladyes importunity, in that reſpect; though the Doctor was ready, as well knowing my diſtance, and inſufficiency to cope with ſo acute and learned a perſon; but all would not do, diſpute I muſt, and being unawares forced into the liſts, a new Argument never drawn before in this field of Controverſie, was now drawn, and brandiſht formidably againſt me, till at laſt I was overthrown, and ſhamefully inſulted over as a vanquiſhed perſon; my Sword being as it were broken over my head with great triumph.

I bore theſe inſults as well as I could: but the Reader may eaſily imagine the anguiſh I was in, eſpecially conſidering ſo many ſpectators preſent as there were. If I had not been ſo much confounded as I was,

I might then have told him as I did afterward; That as it was no diſhonour to *Melanćthon*, ſo neither can it be to any that diſputes for truth, not victory, to anſwer as he did to *Eckius*, *Cras tibi reſpondebo*. However, though I had no intention to have appeared in my own vindication, againſt a man ſo much my ſuperior in place and parts; yet when I conſidered how the truth which I profeſs lay at ſtake, (though I had almoſt loſt the ſenſe of the Doctors Argument) I did after ſome time give him a Letter; which occaſioned his firſt Letter to me, by way of Anſwer, wherein the Grounds he goes upon are laid down, and which afterwards he proceeds to illuſtrate in his following Letters; which being now made publick, I judge my ſelf under a neceſſity, to publiſh the Copies of thoſe Letters of mine, which I have ſent unto him alſo, upon that ſubject, that the Reader may the better be enabled to paſs his judgment upon the ſtate of the Controverſie between us; which I ſuppoſe could not but prudently have been ſuſpended, upon a partial Information only.

In

In order hereunto, I have thought it neceſſary, to draw up the following Scheme of what hath paſſed between the Doctor and my ſelf, in reference to the principal Argument in diſpute between us; the thread whereof might not otherwiſe have been ſo clearly diſcerned, through the interpoſure of divers other intercurring paſſages, in the ſeveral Letters that have paſſed between us. After therefore I had diſpatcht my firſt Letter to him; in his Reply (cutting off what is ſuperfluous and not to the point) he was pleaſed thus to beſpeak me:

Doctor.

Though I cannot believe my ſelf obliged by the occaſional Diſcourſe (which I held about a year and three quarters ago) about Infants Baptiſm, to engage further, and that deliberately too in that Controverſie; yet having received from you ſo large and ſo elaborate an endeavour for my ſatisfaction, ——— I may not be ſo much wanting, either in civility to your deſires, or in obedi-

The Doctors new Argument for Infants-Baptiſm, p. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 52, 53.

ence to the call that I believe in them, as to decline the incumbence and obligation they put me under to answer: and so either to receive my self a further illumination in the Point before us, or (which is better, and which I hope) to give it.

As for my sentiments on this Subject, without concerning of my self in other Arguments insisted on by others, and also touched and reflected on by you, I will immediately proceed to display and lay out the Argument for Pædobaptism, as it is founded on the Covenant or Blessing of *Abraham*, in all its force and evidence; and to do it to some purpose, I will demonstrate,

First, That the Covenant of *Abraham*, which is called *the Blessing of* Abraham, *or the Promise of the Spirit*, is still in force, and is that Covenant of Grace the true believing Gentiles are under.

Secondly, That in respect of that Covenant of Promise, which is called *the blessing of Abraham, and the promise of the Spirit*; all the seed that hath the benefit of it, are under equal obligations to the duty and incumbence

cumbence ariſing from it, that *Abraham* was himſelf.

Thirdly, I will ſhew that the duty and incumbence, ariſing from that Covenant or Bleſſing, to which *Abraham* was obliged; was by way of reſtipulation, to dedicate and give himſelf, and all that was his, to God; and in token of that dedication of himſelf, and all that was his to God, to wear himſelf the ſign of that Covenant; and to put it as a cogniſance, and badge, and mark of God upon all that were his, and were capable of it.

Fourthly, I will alſo ſhew that from *Abraham*'s dedication of himſelf and all his to God, there ariſes a diſtinction of holineſs, into internal and external; abſolute and relative; and that this diſtinction of holineſs is Evangelical.

From all which it will follow; That the true believing Gentiles, which are the Seed of *Abraham*, and as much partakers of the bleſſing of *Abraham* as himſelf, are as much obliged to keep that Covenant of Promiſe, in the ſign and token of it, as *Abraham* and his natural Seed

were: that is, in token of the dedication of themſelves, and all that is theirs; every Father of a Family is to take the ſign of God upon himſelf, and to put it upon all is his, and capable of it; and to be ſure our Children are ours: And ſince circumciſion is no longer that ſign, but Baptiſm is; it is the duty of every Father and Mother of the Family, both to be baptized themſelves, and to ſee that all that are theirs, their own, their property, under their dominion, and at their diſpoſe be ſo. And I think as it is a duty in the Parent, or Father of the Family to give; ſo it is a priviledge in thoſe that are ſo, to be given to God, and to have his ſign upon them.

Apothecary.

Sir,

I have received yours, and ſhall immediately proceed to conſider and give anſwer to the Argument for Pædobaptiſm, founded on the Covenant, or bleſſing of *Abraham*, as it is now repreſented and inſiſted on by you. And as to the four Propoſitions

ons on which your concluſion is founded; I muſt beg your patience to ſee that frame of Argument, which you have ſo ſtrongly built and fortified, diſſolved in theſe following diſtinctions I have made upon them; and conſequently your whole Argument falling with it.

In your firſt Propoſition I only allow the Spiritual eſſence of the Covenant to deſcend upon believing Gentiles: but that the additaments, and appendages, being variable things, and ſeparable from it, do not neceſſarily deſcend with it. As I have elſewhere, at large, evinced unto you.

In your ſecond Propoſition, I allow that the Seed of believing Gentiles that have the benefit of *Abraham*'s Covenant, and to whom it is made, are under an equal obligation unto thoſe proper duties and ſervices now required of them, as *Abraham* was himſelf; underſtanding it of the adult believing off-ſpring, and not the infant Seed of believing Gentiles.

In your third Propoſition, I allow that the believing Gentiles are obliged to dedicate themſelves, and all that is theirs to God, as *Abraham* was. But inaſmuch as there is a double dedication; the one by Baptiſm; and the other by religious Education and fervent ſupplication: this latter dedication I allow: the former, as it reſpects our infant Seed, for the Reaſons I have elſwhere given you, I deny.

In your fourth Propoſition, concerning a two-fold Holineſs, External and Internal; abſolute and relative, ariſing from the Covenant: though I grant that ſo it was under the former Adminiſtration; yet I have elſewhere proved, that as for any External or Relative Holineſs then ariſing from the Covenant, it is now aboliſhed. And as I have already alſo demonſtrated that the 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. doth not at all prove the continuation thereof in the Goſpel day; ſo neither is there any other Scripture, that I know of, that can be pertinently alledged for the juſtification of ſuch a notion: though I grant that there is an external and internal

internal holineſs now ariſing among Gentile Profeſſors: the latter from the Covenant; the former from a meer pretenſion to it.

In theſe four Propoſitions lies the main ſtrength of your New Argument for Infants Baptiſm. And *Gen.* 17. where the Covenant God made with *Abraham*, is recorded, is the only Text you bottom upon; the grounds of Infant Baptiſm, according to you, being to be found there, or no where. That they are not to be found there, will appear, I ſuppoſe, in the iſſue. That they are not to be found in the New Teſtament, your ſelf have confeſſed to me in theſe words of your firſt Letter, *p.* 62. where you tell me, 'That we are not to expect any New 'Commands in the Goſpel Diſpen-'ſation for duties ſettled of old, on 'laſting and immutable Reaſons; and more expreſly, you tell the Reader in your Epiſtle, *p.* 10. 'That in the 'New Teſtament, no new Rule is 'given either by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, 'or by his Apoſtles and Followers, 'about the ſubjects of the ſign of the 'Covenant, which ſign now is Bap-'tiſm. And therefore certainly (ſay 'you)

'you) it leaves us to the Grounds 'and Reaſons of the Old Teſtament. Now I ſuppoſe, your ſelf and all will grant that if a Rule for Infant Baptiſm is not to be found in *Gen.* 17. it is not to be found in any *other* Old Teſtament Text. And if it be to be found in that Text; it is incumbent on you who aſſert it, to prove, Firſt, your three parties in the Covenant there mentioned. Secondly, your two Signs. Thirdly, that *Abraham* repreſented the carnal Seed only, in Circumciſion; and *Iſaac* the Spiritual Seed in Baptiſm; though himſelf the Head and Figure of Gentile Believers, was never baptized, nor the ordinance of Baptiſm inſtituted for many hundred years after his death. Your proofs for all theſe Aſſertions, or rather ungrounded hypotheſes, come in order to be conſidered, after I have traced your more general diſcourſes.

At preſent all I ſhall ſay is only this; That it is apparent unto me at leaſt, that there is an abſolute neceſſity to keep cloſe unto *New Teſtament* Commands about *New Teſtament* Worſhip; that Text in *Geneſis* you inſiſt on, (as far as my Eyes

do

do ſerve me) having no fellowſhip with the preſent Argument, or cogency to evince the Juſtice of the preſent practice. And therefore though it may be good to argue thus; It is Gods mind, therefore it is to be done; yet it is too much for us to argue, this ſhould be, and therefore God hath appointed it; inaſmuch as no Reaſon of ours in poſitive Worſhip, ſuch as Baptiſm is, but Gods will alone, gathered by ſome expreſs command or example in the New Teſtament, can acquit an action ſo performed from the guilt of Will-worſhip.

Doctor.

If I thought it could be denied that Baptiſm is the ſign of the Covenant of Grace, I ſhould think it eaſie to evince it: But I take it for granted that Baptiſm is now, as Circumciſion was the ſign of the Covenant in the Evangelical Adminiſtration, becauſe it is the Reſtipulation, and Anſwer of a good Conſcience to God. And becauſe it hath the ſame uſe now that Circumciſion had, *viz.* p. 54.

to

to be the right of Matriculation and our Aſſignation. And becauſe elſe (which is hard to think) there is now no ſuch Sign and Token of the Covenant; whereas if in Circumciſion (Gods ſign) in Baptiſm the name of God is put upon us to mark us for his. And taking it for granted, and allowing the Grounds which I have laid; you may ſee the Reaſon why in the Primitive times whole Houſes were baptized? it is on the ſame account, and for the ſame Reaſons that *Abraham*'s whole Houſe was Circumciſed. Thus it is ſaid, *Act.* 11. 14. that *Peter* ſhould tell *Cornelius* words, *by which he and all his Houſe ſhould be ſaved.* And *Act.* 16. 15. it is ſaid, but of *Lydia*, That ſhe believed: but of her and her Houſhold, that they were baptized. And *Act.* 16. 31. It is promiſed to the Gaoler, That on his Faith, not only himſelf but his Houſhold ſhould be ſaved. *Believe thou on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and thou ſhalt be ſaved, and thy Houſe.*

* Where by the way, take notice;

* The Reader is deſired to take notice, That this laſt paſſage is now left out in the printed copy of the Doctors firſt Letter: though he was pleaſed thus to expreſs himſelf in the firſt edition of that Letter to me.

there

there is a viſible Salvation on anothers Faith; *Believe thou, and thy Houſe ſhall be ſaved.* And why the Houſe on his Faith? and how ſaved, but externally, becauſe baptized? And there are many Scriptures to like purpoſe.

Apothecary.

Whereas you tell me, 'That the 'Reaſon why in the Primitive times, 'whole Houſes were baptized, is 'the ſame upon the account of which '*Abraham's* whole Houſe was Circumciſed. That the reaſon is not the ſame is evident; inaſmuch as Baptiſm did not take place in the manner that Circumciſion did: For Circumciſion was but in one Family, ſingled out from all the Families of the Earth, of the Males only, whether in the Covenant of Grace or no, Children or Servants, elder or younger, at eight days old, by the Maſter of the Family, or others in his ſtead: But in Baptiſm it is clean otherwiſe, and therefore the reaſon of the one cannot be the reaſon of the other. And as to the bringing in

of

of whole Families together; it was but contingently ſo, not always ſo, nor conſtantly ſo, according to any Promiſe or Prophecy; and when it did ſo happen, we find not any Infant baptized, nor any intimation of baptizing Houſholds in conformity to the adminiſtration of Circumciſion, but rather the contrary; expreſs notice being given, of the Faith and Repentance of thoſe admitted unto Baptiſm, in the ſeveral Houſholds recorded to have been baptized; whereas all were to be circumciſed, that were of *Abraham*'s Family, both Children, Servants, Slaves and all; whether making a profeſſion of Faith and Repentance or no. And this may appear by taking a view of the ſeveral examples of Baptizing, recorded in the New Teſtament; which I have elſewhere ſpread before you.

Only at preſent, as to that that concerns the example of *Lydia*, it muſt of neceſſity be underſtood ſuitable to the other inſtances, which when they expreſs the baptizing of Houſholds, they expreſs alſo the believing or receiving of the Word by the.

the whole Houſhold; and by the frequent uſe of the Word, which is to put the Houſe, for the people of growth in it. As to that which concerns the Gaoler; it doth not appear unto me from the Scripture you mention, nor from any other; That there is a viſible Salvation grounded on external holineſs; or that any are ſaved by anothers faith, as you would have it: It being manifeſt by the following Words, That thoſe of the Gaolers Family were ſaved by their *own* Faith, and not by the Faith of *another:* For though *ver.* 31. it was ſaid unto him; *Believe thou on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and thou ſhalt be ſaved and thy Houſe*; yet it is expreſly told us, *ver.* 34. *That when he had brought them into his Houſe, he rejoyced, believing in God with* all his Houſe. And that the Salvation here ſpoken of, is not to be underſtood of a 'viſible, external Salvation, becauſe 'baptized (as you expreſs it) is 'evident: for that this would have been but a poor comfort to the poor trembling Gaoler; of whom it is ſaid, *v.*29,30. That *he ſprang in and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas,* ſaying,

saying, *Sirs, what must I do to be saved?* Certainly he was now toucht with a sense of his eternal state: the Reply whereunto must therefore of necessity be correspondent.

Doctor.

* p 55,56. Thus ran the Drs. first Letter to me; thô this passage is now somewhat altered in the printed copy thereof.

* It seems to me to answer exactly to the Promise given to the Church under the Messiah, that magnificent one; for so *Jer.* 30. 31. it should be rendred, and not in the plural, as we do read it. To the letter, it is not their Nobles, as in our translation, but their magnificent one, or their Noble one shall be of themselves, and their Governour shall proceed from the midst of them. Now the Promise is, that when this Noble and magnificent one, the Shiloh should come out of the Loins of *Judah*, and take the Soveragn Government and Power, and have the chief administration of things in his own hand: Then in that glorious and Evangelical Dispensation, Their Children should be as afore-time: their Children should be solemnly dedicated, and given up to God, and put into his protection;

tection, and in token of it be baptized, as in aforetime they were Circumcised, *Jer.* 30. 20, 21.

Apothecary.

I am not convinced that this Scripture in the 30. of *Jeremiah* hath at all any reference to the present purpose; and I presume the true sense and scope of it to be mistaken in your application of it. I acknowledge that all the Promises, precedent and consequent in that context, relate to the happiness of the Church, in the Kingdom of the Messiah, when that Noble and Magnificent one should come, and have the chief administration of things in his own hands; amongst which this is one, *Their Children should be as afore-time.* But what then? doth it therefore follow, that their Infant Seed should be baptized, in token of their dedication to God, as in afore-time they were Circumcised? was there ever such an inference drawn from this Text before? Certain it is that there are many hundreds of places in the Scripture, that might easily be alledged, wherein

wherein *Children* are mentioned, where yet *Infants* cannot be at all intended. And it is as plain, that as for the preſent Words, according to the current expoſition of the place, it muſt needs be underſtood of the body of the Jewiſh Nation, frequently in Scripture called the *Children* of *Iſrael*; and that their being as afore-time, only points back to the moſt proſperous ſtate of that people and particularly to the reigns of *David* and *Solomon*, at which time that Kingdom was at the higheſt exaltation of its proſperity and glory. I deſire you therefore to examine ſuch Expoſitors as you have by you upon the place. I ſuppoſe you are furniſhed with more than my ſelf: but I am apt to think, among them all, you will hardly find your own expoſition.

Doctor.

p. 56. Well may the Children in the Goſpel Diſpenſation be as afore-time; ſince though the Jews are cut off, the Gentiles are graffed in upon the ſame ſtock: not indeed upon the legal

legal Branch, but upon the Root Olive, which affordeth all the nouriſhment that either the Jews had, or the Gentiles have. Which Root Olive is the Covenant of Promiſe, that was four hundred and thirty years before the Law. Now into that ſtate of things, wherein not the Law, but the Goſpel preached unto *Abraham* did obtain; God was a God not only to the Father, but to the Children: yea to all his Family. And the Father of the Family did not only give himſelf, but all his Children, and even his Servants, all his to God. And ſo it is now, your Children ſhall be as aforetime.

Apothecary.

As for the Root mentioned, *Rom.* 11. to which I ſuppoſe you refer: it is indeed variouſly conceived by Interpreters; ſome underſtanding thereby the Covenant to be meant, ſome *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*: and ſome *Abraham* only. For my own part; I believe that Chriſt himſelf is thereby to be underſtood; who is the only Root

Root of the Church; and that both in *Abraham*'s time, and before, as well as ſince. To this purpoſe himſelf tells us, *John* 15. 5. *I am the Vine, ye are the Branches.* And to this purpoſe alſo, *Rev.* 22. 16. he ſtiles himſelf, *The Root and the Off-ſpring of David.* It is indeed therefore the unſpeakable bleſſedneſs of Gentile Believers, to be graffed in upon ſuch a Stock, not upon the legal Branch, but upon the Root Olive; which affordeth all the nouriſhment that either the Jews had, or the Gentiles have. That Root Olive being no other than Chriſt himſelf, who was indeed given for a *Covenant of the people, and a Light to lighten the Gentiles.* The Goſpel of whoſe Grace was (as you ſay) preached to *Abraham* four hundred and thirty years (at leaſt) before the Law was given. But what then? doth it therefore follow that the believing Gentiles are put into that very ſtate of things, as the promiſe held it ſo long before the Law? Where is that Scripture that ſays it? *Jer.* 30. the Scripture before mentioned, ſpeaks no ſuch thing: nor any other that I can meet with.

Evident

Evident it is, that though Circumciſion was in uſe before as well as under the Law; and though Jeſus Chriſt himſelf is by the Apoſtle ſtiled the Miniſter of the Circumciſion, for the truth of God, to confirm the Promiſes made unto the Fathers; yet as it cannot be denied, but that it was *adopted* into the legal Family; and that it was alſo *adapted* unto the nature and quality of the legal Diſpenſation: So it is as evident that it is now aboliſhed. And I can meet with no one Text in all the New Teſtament, that tells us that Baptiſm is come in the room thereof; or that it is appointed to have the ſame place and uſe in the Church of God, that Circumciſion had, but rather much to the contrary, as I have elſewhere proved to you: And it being manifeſt, that the external adminiſtration of the Covenant is now changed, from what it was in *Abraham*'s time; from thence it doth as plainly follow, that there is an alteration of the Rule, that muſt direct us in our practice in that reſpect.

Doctor

Doctor.

p. 62, 63. It cannot be denied but that the true ſeed (the believing Gentiles) are as much obliged to keep the Covenant in the ſign of it, both by taking it upon themſelves, and by putting it upon their Children; as *Abraham* was for himſelf and his. And this is the proper duty required of them, as they are partakers of the bleſſing of *Abraham*. Nor are we to expect any New Commands in the Goſpel-Diſpenſation for duties ſetled of old, on laſting and immutable Reaſons; the obligation abiding, if the reaſon of the precept abides. A principle that is the ground of the Apoſtles Reaſoning, 1 *Cor.* 9. 8, 9. 10. And ſhall the Principle abide, and not the duty which ariſes from it? the Covenant abide, and not the Reſtipulation, without which it is not a Covenant? This you dare not ſay.

Apothecary.

Apothecary.

How fair and ſpecious a ſtructure may there be erected upon a falſe or a wrong Hypotheſis. All this Diſcourſe of yours proceeds from a miſtake in the very foundation of your Argument: For you ſuppoſe, and would fain have it taken for granted, That the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham* under the Goſpel, are under an obligation from *Gen.* 17. to keep the Covenant in *the ſign of it*; and that both by taking it upon *themſelves*, and by putting it upon their *Children* alſo; whereas there is not a Word or Syllable there, or any where elſe in all the Old Teſtament, That the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham* under the Goſpel, were to keep the Covenant *in the ſign of it*; much leſs that they were to *put it upon themſelves*; and leaſt of all, that they were to *put it upon their Children alſo.* All theſe are meer *Inventions*, and *unproved Dictates.* And therefore though we may not expect any New commands in the Goſpel-Diſpenſation for *duties ſetled of old*, on

laſting and immutable Reaſons; becauſe the Obligation abides, if the reaſon of the Precept abides: yet what ſhall we ſay when that which we ſuppoſe or affirm of this kind, is but a meer *Chimera*, or a fancy of our own Brain only? Let it once be ſubſtantially proved, either from the 17th. of *Geneſis*, or from any other Text in the Old Teſtament, what you have now aſſerted; and then your conſequence ſhall be as readily granted.

Doctor.

p. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27. I pray conſider, That not only *Abraham* was under Obligation to keep the Covenant in the ſign of it, but the Seed of *Abraham* alſo; that is, all thoſe to whom the Covenant is made, are equally obliged to the obſervation thereof *in the ſign of it:* (and therefore) not only *Abraham* was obliged, but his Seed too. For as God is pleaſed to ſay; *I will be a God to thee and to thy Seed: and I will give to thee and to thy Seed:* So he ſayes, *Thou and thy Seed ſhall keep my*

my Covenant. Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore; (and not only thou, but) *thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations: Thou, thou and thy Seed.*

So that if the Believing Gentiles be (as indeed they be) the true Seed, and principally intended in the Promiſe; (For it is Seed, not Seeds; Seed ſpeaking but of one, and that one is Chriſt; and Chriſt not perſonal only, but myſtical, or Chriſt with his members; for it is of many in one: for the Seed which is to keep the Covenant, is to do it in *their Generations*; not in *his Generation*, but in *their Generations*, and that is plural.) I ſay, if the *Believing Gentiles* do become the Seed of *Abraham*, (as they do) they come alſo under *equal Obligation* to obſerve the Covenant, with *Abraham* himſelf; for it is, *Thou ſhalt keep the Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed.* And to keep the Covenant (as I have evinced already) is for him that is in it, in token of his dedication, and aſſignment of himſelf, and of all his to God, not only to wear the ſign of the Covenant himſelf in his own

perſon, but to put it upon all his that are capable of it; ſo to manifeſt, that he owns not any intereſt or propriety at all in any thing, or title to any, but what he returns to God; and that both himſelf and all his, are the Lords. And are not the Believing Gentiles as much obliged to aſſign, and dedicate, and give all, as *Abraham?* Yes, doubtleſs, and are as much bound to ſhew, and own, and declare they do ſo, as he.

And though (as you object) Circumciſion, that at *firſt* was the ſign and token of the Covenant, is taken away; yet it will not follow, that the Obligation to obſerve and keep the Covenant in any *other* ſign or token doth ceaſe with it. And to demonſtrate this, it muſt be minded, that as the equity and Reaſon of the command doth hold in Baptiſm, as well as in Circumciſion; and for any other ſign and token, as well as for this; and to the Seed as well as to *Abraham*; God being as much a God to the one, as to the other: So alſo that in the form of the Words, the obligation impoſed upon *Abraham* and his

his Seed, is in the *First* place, to keep the ſign and token of the Covenant, or to keep the Covenant in the ſign of it. And but in the *Second* (place,) to obſerve circumciſion; namely, but as it is that ſign: So that a plain diſtinction is made between the *Obligation*, to obſerve the *Sign* and *Token* of the Covenant, (or to keep the Covenant in the ſign and token of it) and to keep it in *Circumciſion*, as that Sign and Token; the *Former* ariſing from the very nature of the Covenant, (*Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore*) and therefore of as perpetual obligation and exiſtence, as the Covenant it ſelf: But the *Latter* is more poſitive and ſecondary. Wherefore, though there be an alteration in the ſecond, it will not follow that there muſt be one in the Firſt; or that the Covenant ought not to be obſerved in the Sign and token of it, if for certain Reaſons, Circumciſion be no longer, but ſomething elſe be that Sign and Token; the taking away the *Second*, doth not deſtroy the firſt, for being before it, it may be without it. Thou ſhalt keep the ſign of the Co-

venant, that is first; Circumcision is that Sign, that is Second: And why *one* in the first place, and the *other* but in the Second, but to shew, the Covenant must be kept in the Sign of it, even when no longer Circumcision, but some other thing is in the Counsel of God ordained to be that Sign?

Apothecary.

As to the first part of what you now offer; though I do acknowledge that the true Believing Gentiles, as *Isaac* was, are the Children of the Promise. And though I do also acknowledge that since the taking down of the partition-wall by the death of Christ, the believing Jews and the believing Gentiles are no more distinguished, and of different Seeds, as many, or diverse; but are made one in Christ; yet I deny that the Holy Ghost in this Text points at any New Testament Sign, with which the Spiritual Seed were to be signed in the Gospel Day; their Obligation to wear the Gospel sign, being wholly left unto the time

time of its Inſtitution; which determines both the ſubjects and the duties thereof. And,

As for the ſecond part of what you now offer; having diligently examined the Scripture which I ſuppoſe you referr to; *viz. Gen.* 17. For my own part, I muſt needs profeſs, I can find no ſuch diſtinction there, as is ſuggeſted by you: for thus run the Words, *ver.* 9. *God ſaid unto Abraham, Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou, and thy Seed after thee in their Generations.* Ver. 10. *This is my Covenant, which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy Seed after thee; every Man-Child among you ſhall be Circumciſed.* Where I can find no ſuch diſtinction as you obſerve; 'That '*Abraham* and his Seed were enjoyn-'ed, *firſt* to keep the Covenant *in* '*the ſign of it*; And in the *Second* '*place*, to keep it in Circumciſion, 'as that ſign. For the immediate Obligation which was laid upon *Abraham*, and his Seed after him in their Generations, was not to keep the Covenant *in the ſign of it* in general terms, as you would have it; but to keep it in that particular ſign

of Circumcision; there being in that Scripture no other sign mentioned, or implyed; in which the latter words are only exegetical of the former, *Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore*, &c. in the 9. Verse; And how? the 10. Verse explains, Namely, in Circumcision.

Doctor.

p. 84. 85. Seeing this Objection hath something in it very pertinent: (for I will do you all the right imaginable) I hold my self obliged in order to the removing of it, and consequently to the further illustrating, and clearing of my Argument, to shew, First, That the immediate obligation, and incumbence mentioned in the 9. Verse, cannot be to keep the Covenant in, but Circumcision, or in Circumcision only. And consequently that what is said, Verse 10. is not meerly exegetical of the obligation in the 9.

Secondly, That the immediate Obligation, and incumbence in the 9. Verse, is to keep the Covenant in the sign of it; this is Primary:

And

And then, that which is added in the 10. Verſe, is but a ſecondary inſtitution of a particular ſign for that time. And,

Thirdly, I will ſhew, that there is a plain intimation, and conſequently more than a meer hint, that ſome other ſign muſt be obſerved by the Seed than that of Circumciſion.

Apothecary.

Sir, I muſt needs tell you; That notwithſtanding all the pains you have taken, in your ſecond Letter, toward the proof of the three particulars, now mentioned by you: you are yet extreamly defective therein.

For, Firſt, You have told me indeed (to this purpoſe) by way of confirmation of your firſt particular, 'That the immediate Obligation and 'incumbence mentioned in the 9. 'Verſe, cannot be to keep the Co'venant in Circumciſion only: be'cauſe as God promiſeth to be a 'God unto *Abraham*, and his Spiritu'al Seed: So the Spiritual Seed, as

'well as *Abraham* himſelf, are equal-
'ly bound to keep the Covenant.
'And ſince the Spiritual Seed of
'*Abraham* under the Goſpel, are no
'way obliged unto Circumciſion;
'ſome other ſign therefore (ſay you)
'muſt be intended in the Text. But
this is not home enough to the pur-
poſe; for the Argument would ra-
ther run thus: That therefore it is
the more convincingly evident, that
the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham* under
the Goſpel, are no way concerned
in that Obligation; becauſe without
giving the leaſt hint of any other
ſign: Circumciſion, the only ſign
there mentioned, hath relation to
Abraham, and his natural off-ſpring
and family only.

Secondly, Whereas you tell me,
'That the immediate Obligation and
'incumbence in the 9. Verſe, is to
'keep the Covenant, *in the ſign of it*;
'which you ſay, was *Primary*. And
'that which is added in the 10. is but
'a *Secondary* inſtitution of a particular
'ſign for that time. This being
without a ſubſtantial proof, is but
a meer *Petitio Principii*: or a plain
begging the Point in diſpute, upon
which

which the ſtreſs of the whole depends. For as it is evident that the words in the 10. Verſe, are only exegetical of thoſe in the 9. And as it is evident that neither in the 9. nor in the 10. is there any other ſign mentioned, but the ſign of Circumciſion only: So it is as evident that the words in the 9. Verſe, do neither *expreſs*, nor give any *intimation* of any ſign at all, that God intended ſhould be annexed to the Covenant, as the token, badge, or cogniſance of it; there being no ſuch term, or a ſyllable of that found in the Text: For there God only commands *Abraham* to keep his Covenant; and doth not ſay: Thou ſhalt keep it *in the ſign of it:* that being *your addition* only. In the 10. Verſe, indeed we have a particular explanation of what had been delivered in general terms in the 9. *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy Seed after the; every Man-child among you ſhall be circumciſed.* So that it is apparent that the latter words are only exegetical of the former; and are therefore the *Primary*, and not the *Secondary* Inſtitution of

a.

a particular ſign, as you would have it.

And Thirdly, your aſſertion therefore is groundleſs, when you tell me, 'That there is a plain intima-'tion in the 9. Verſe, and conſe-'quently more than a meer hint, 'that ſome other ſign muſt be ob-'ſerved by the Seed than that of 'Circumciſion: For though the *Subſtance* of the Covenant on *Gods part*, doth *now* belong equally to Believing Gentiles, as well as to Believing *Abraham*, and his Believing off-ſpring *then*; yet as to what concerns the *Obligation*, there is nothing expreſſed in the whole 17. of *Geneſis*, but what relates to *Abraham* and his Natural Seed and Family only. Under the Goſpel indeed, the Believing Gentiles are taught what God *now* requires of them, as their duty by way of Reſtipulation: But as this place of *Geneſis* gives no hint at all of Gods mind in that reſpect; ſo neither was there any neceſſity thereof; God only then deſigning to ſignifie unto *Abraham*, together with his natural Seed and Family, what was their preſent duty, under the

the then preſent Adminiſtration, and not otherwiſe.

You your ſelf cannot but acknowledge that the Obligation mentioned in the 10. Verſe, muſt of neceſſity be underſtood in relation only to the Natural Seed of *Abraham*; becauſe the Seed there ſpoken of are expreſly enjoyned to be Circumciſed. And if ſo, then it clearly follows, that the general obligation lying upon the Seed, mentioned in the 9. Verſe, muſt be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe alſo: For to ſay that the Spiritual Seed under the Goſpel, muſt be underſtood in the 9. and the Natural Seed only in the 10. is a moſt harſh way of the interpretation of the word of God: it being utterly improbable, that there ſhould be ſuch a ſudden tranſition from one Seed to another, without any notice given thereof. But as this would be to make the Scripture unintelligible to a vulgar Capacity; ſo the Words in both Verſes being but one continued Speech, and the Spirit of God plainly ſpeaking, in both, of one and the ſame ſort of Seed, on whom the Covenant of Circumciſion (as

Stephen

Stephen expreſly calls it, *Acts* 7. 8.) was then to be impoſed; and there being not the leaſt hint in that whole context, of any other ſign, that God intended ſhould be obſerved in the Goſpel-day: there cannot eaſily be a greater violence offered to the Word of God, than to endeavour to faſten ſuch a ſenſe as you do upon it. But certain it is, God never intended to leave his inſtituted Worſhip to ſuch ambiguous uncertainties, which require ſuch a circumlocution of Words and Arguments, for the demonſtration of them, as you are forced to uſe in the preſent caſe in your ſecond Letter; and which a common capacity cannot comprehend, when all is done.

I know you have endeavoured to confirm your expoſition of this Text in *Geneſis*, from the like form of Words in the Fourth Commandment, in relation to the Sabbath: But I ſuppoſe I have given you a ſufficient anſwer to that in my ſecond Letter, which I need not here repeat.

Doctor.

Doctor.

Conſider ſeriouſly, how plain and eaſie a ſenſe this is I have of the Words (in diſpute) *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed after thee.* Between me the Lord, and thee *Abraham*, and thy Seed *Iſaac* in the Letter and Spirit, to be a God to thee *Abraham*, and to thy Seed after thee, *Iſaac* in the Letter and Spirit. Verſe 8. And I will give to thee *Abraham*, and to thy Seed *Iſaac* in the Letter and Spirit, all the Land in which thou art a Stranger. Even the Land of *Canaan*, in the Letter, to *Iſaac* in the Letter; and the World, the whole World, in the Spirit and Myſtery, to *Iſaac* in the myſtery. Verſe 9. And therefore thou *Abraham* and thy Seed *Iſaac* in the Letter and Spirit, ſhall keep (the ſign of) my Covenant. Verſe 10. (But) This is (the ſign of) my Covenant which ye which are now here, thou *Abraham*, and *Iſhmael* thy Son, according to the fleſh , and the reſt of thy Houſhold here, which ſtand for all the P. 134, 135

the Seed according to the fleſh, as ſo; This is (the ſign of) my Covenant which ye for your part, ſhall keep, (as a ſign of the Covenant I have made between me and ye, and thy Seed *Iſaac*, the Seed of the Promiſe, and not of the Fleſh) *Every Man-Child among you* (ye the Natural Family and Carnal Seed) *ſhall be Circumciſed.* Among you, he doth not ſay among the Seed; the Seed is to keep the Covenant in *a* ſign, verſe 9. But the Natural Family only are to keep it in *this* Sign, in Circumciſion. *Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore,* (in the Sign of it) *thou and thy Seed.* (But) *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep,* &c. *Every Man-Child ſhall be Circumciſed.*

Apothecary.

Your Paraphraſe upon the Words is two ways faulty: For firſt it is forced; not natural nor obvious. And Secondly, it is repugnant both to the Text, and to it ſelf. Firſt to the Text, in forcing one Sign upon it, more than it ever intended, *viz.* Baptiſm. Secondly, to it ſelf, and

and the Text too: For if the Natural Seed were to keep it in *this* Sign, *viz.* in Circumciſion; and the Spiritual Seed in *the* Sign, *viz.* in Baptiſm; and if *Iſaac* be the Spiritual Seed; then it follows, if *Iſaac* ſuſtain only the capacity, and relation of the Spiritual Seed, he ought not to be Circumciſed, which he was: if of the Natural and Spiritual Seed too, (as you make him) he ſhould be both Circumciſed and Baptized alſo, which he was not. Yea, according to your reckoning, *Abraham* himſelf, as well as *Iſaac*, ſhould have been Baptized: For if the Sign in the 9. Verſe be Baptiſm, as you intimate; the Obligation there, is on *Abraham* and *Iſaac* too, in the Letter, as well as on the Seed in the Goſpel-day: For thus runs your own Paraphraſe upon the Words, 'Therefore 'thou *Abraham*, and thy Seed *Iſaac* 'in the Letter and Spirit, ſhall keep 'the Sign of my Covenant. That is, according to *your Senſe*; Both he and they, and thou alſo muſt be Baptized.

'Tis

'Tis true, the *true Senſe* of the Words we all know (or ſhould know at leaſt) is this; *Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed*, Verſe 9. That is, *Both thou and thy Seed ſhall be Circumciſed*; as the 10. Verſe declares: And ſo the Words run ſmoothly, without jarring, ſuitable to the plain ſcope of the Spirit of God in the following Words. But according to the courſe that you take, I do not ſee how you can poſſibly avoid the abſurdity; but that the ſenſe muſt be plainly this: Thou, even thou *Abraham* ſhalt be Baptized, as well as Circumciſed; as alſo thy Seed *Iſaac* in the Letter, together with thy Seed *Iſaac* in the Spirit, (or thy Spiritual Seed in the Goſpel-day) as the proper Sign of that Covenant, which I have now made both with thee and them.

Doctor.

P. 160, 161, 162. It is a bold abuſe you put upon me, when you intimate as my Opinion, That Baptiſm is *immediately intended* in the 9. Verſe. Whereas (you know)

I have told you ten times over, That I underſtand the keeping of the Covenant there *generally*, for keeping of it in the Sign of it (whatever the Sign at any time be) and not *particularly* and *determinately* for keeping of it *immediately* either in Circumciſion, or in Baptiſm. Indeed in that moment, when the general Obligation was impoſed of keeping the Sign, neither Baptiſm nor Circumciſion in *particular was* yet Inſtituted; though Circumciſion was in the very next Moment. I confeſs, had the keeping of the Covenant in the ſign of it, which is the duty enjoyned in the 9. Verſe, been a keeping of it *particularly*, and *determinately* in either Baptiſm, or Circumciſion; then (as you object) either *Abraham* muſt have been *Baptized*, if Baptiſm had been intended particularly; or elſe, *Iſaac* in the Spirit (the Believing Gentiles, the true Spiritual Seed) muſt have been Circumciſed, if Circumciſion had immediately and particularly been meant: But that *term* being underſtood but *generally* and *indeterminately*; *Abraham* and his Seed are only obliged by it to keep the

the Covenant in *ſome* Sign; in that ſign *reſpectively*, which ſhould be the Sign of their reſpective times: And thus *Abraham* did keep it in Circumciſion, the ſign in his time; and ſo did *Iſaac* in the Letter, as the Natural Off-ſpring of *Abraham*, in the Sign that then was: But Spiritual *Iſaac* (or the Believing Gentiles) could not keep it in the Sign *then*; they not having Being *then*, and ſo no particular Sign was ordained for them *then*; but when ever they ſhould be, They (being the Seed of *Abraham*) are tyed by the obligation (Verſe 9.) to keep the Covenant in the Sign of it, *viz.* In that Sign which then ſhould be (the Sign) when they became Seed.

Apothecary.

In this you ſeem to me to give up your Cauſe for loſt: You now tax me for a bold abuſe, in ſaying, 'That 'you intimate that Baptiſm is *imme-* 'diately intended in the 9. Verſe of 'Gen. 17. Mark your own Word; not *inſtituted* but *intended*: Whence I argue, if Baptiſm be neither there *inſtituted*,

inſtituted, nor *intended*; if it be neither in the *Letter* nor *Intention* of that Text, it is not there *at all*. And all the noiſe you have made about it, is but a beating of the Air. And whereas you do alſo tell me; the ſenſe is *indeterminate* and *general*: Here you leave me a fair Field; for whether the ſenſe be determinate or no, I appeal to all the rational World to determine; except you will dare to interrupt the Spirit of God in a continued Speech, break the Series of his Diſcourſe, put a ſtop where you pleaſe, before he hath ſpoken out, and catch one part, before the other, which determines the ſenſe, be uttered; and then call it *indeterminate* and *general*. But this is not to be endured among men; you your ſelf would not ſuffer it to be thus handled: much leſs will God ſuffer it. Doth not God in the ſame breath (as I may ſay) determine the ſenſe, and tell you wherein the Covenant is to be kept, namely in Circumciſion? Do not theſe Words immediately follow the former; *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep*, &c. *Every Man-child among*

you

you ſhall be Circumciſed? And do they not determine the ſenſe? What a liberty do you take, not only to interpret this Text, but to rend one part from another, and put Periods where you pleaſe? But why do I beat the Buſh, when the Bird is fled? Baptiſm it ſeems, is neither in the *Letter*, nor *intention* of *Gen.* 17. 9. and if ſo, the Diſpute is ended, and we are where we were before. Had there been *a* ſign, or *the* ſign in the 9. Verſe, diſtinct from that in the 10. the one Baptiſm, the other Circumciſion; *Iſhmael* the ſubject of the latter, as a repreſentative of the Carnal Seed; and *Iſaac* of the former, as a figure of the Spiritual: (as your former Diſcourſes ran) then *Iſaac* muſt have been *Baptized*, or elſe you make him a ſtrange Figure. But now you yield, he was neither Baptized in his own perſon, nor Baptiſm ſo much as *intended* in the 9. Verſe: And what more ſatisfaction can I expect from you? you may diſtinguiſh *the*, *thou*, and *ye*, and *you*, and *thy Seed after thee*, as ſubtilly as you can.

But

But though you acknowledg Baptiſm is not the *immediate* ſenſe of Verſe 9. Yet it may be you will tell me, It is the *remote* ſenſe: Yes ſure, *remote* enough, and out of the ken of all men beſide your ſelf. But I pray you, where do you find this *remote ſenſe*, and what is the *immediate* ſenſe, if neither Circumciſion nor Baptiſm be there? The Covenant it ſeems, according to this reckoning, may be kept without any ſign; which yet you would not allow of formerly. But pray tell me, How was *Abraham* and his to keep it in the *general*, *indeterminate* ſenſe, which is neither in the one, or the other ſign? I am afraid this will puzzle you; if not you, it doth ſuch a ſoft head as mine. Did not you tell me in your laſt; The Covenant muſt be kept in ſome ſign; and yet now it may be kept without any? *Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee*, that is, *in the ſign of it*: But that muſt not be underſtood, ſay you, in any *particular*, or *determinate* ſenſe; but in *general* only: For though Baptiſm is intended, yet it is not *immediately* intended, but *remotely*

motely only: but you may diſtinguiſh as you pleaſe, Baptiſm, I am ſure, is not to be found in the *expreſs* words of the Text; and you your ſelf do now acknowledge, it is not in the *immediate* ſenſe; and I have proved that the ſenſe cannot be *general* and *indeterminate*. What need any more ado then to darken counſel thus, by words without knowledge? There ſeemed once *a* ſign, or *the* ſign, in the 9. Verſe, diſtinct from that in the 10. but now it is vaniſht, and there is no ſign there at all, only in a *general*, *indeterminate*, and *remote* ſenſe, that is, in *no* ſenſe. So that *Abraham* and his, according to your interpretation, were obliged to keep the Covenant in a *nonſenſe* way.

The

THE Reader is desired to take notice, that the Doctor never yet gave me any answer to this last Reply of mine; nor indeed unto many other passages of a like importance, contained in my sixth and last Letter to him, (hereafter inserted) in reference whereunto, he hath been hitherto wholly silent. He acknowledgeth indeed in his Preface to the Reader, p. 3. 'That he had 'received a Letter from me, since 'his last: but withal says; 'That that 'Letter (as others) was so little to 'the purpose, unless reflections and 'extravagancies be so, that he did 'not find himself obliged to any other 'answer, than what in his last is ad-'ded and marked with an Asterism 'thus *, and that, as himself acknow-'ledgeth, is but little; being (saith 'he) but one Paragraph, and two 'or three Words by way of illustra-'tion. And for that that is, for my own part, I do not see how it comes to *bear* upon any part of my last Let-

ter, by way of anſwer thereunto. The Doctor indeed tells the Reader, That that Letter of mine is but little to the purpoſe; it may be it is but little to *his* purpoſe, but I hope it is enough to *mine*: But whether it be ſo extravagant, and ſo little to the purpoſe, as the Doctor would have it; or whether he would not have anſwered it, were it not for the knots that are in it, which he could not untie; is now to be referred to the Readers judgment.

The Doctor tells me indeed, *p.* 1-4. in the latter end of his fourth Letter, which that laſt Letter of mine gives anſwer unto: 'That I had treated 'him but (as *Æſop* did his Maſters 'Gueſts) with Tongue, Tongue 'ſtill, nothing but Tongue in ſeveral 'diſhes. I hope the Reader will find ſomewhat of *Brain*, as well as *Tongue*. However Tongue is good meat, and many Men much affect it; either when themſelves carve it, and others receive it with admiration; or others carve it, and they receive it, well ſawced with adulation.

There

There is one thing more which I judge it needful to give the Reader Advertiſement of; and that is, That that which the Doctor calls his firſt Letter, is to ſpeak truth, no other than two Letters conjoyned in one, or his firſt and ſecond Letters united together: For whereas I had ſent him my ſecond Letter in anſwer to that which was indeed his firſt; by way of reply, he was pleaſed to ſend me back again, almoſt an entire tranſcript of his firſt Letter, interſprinkled with ſome animadverſions on my anſwer: wherein, himſelf now acknowledgeth in his Preface; That as he thought, I had obliged him to make ſeveral additions and alterations, as well as emendations, by my anſwer thereunto. And this is that which he now calls his firſt Letter, which therefore hath a double date. If therefore the Reader find one or two paſſages in the foregoing Scheme, which are not now to be found in that firſt Letter of his, as it is now altered; this which I have now ſaid, will afford a ſufficient reaſon for the ſame.

And because I thought it might be burthensome to the Reader to peruse all the several Letters which I have sent unto the Doctor upon the foregoing subject; especially considering the substance of them hath been already presented in the foregoing Scheme: I have therefore only subjoyned my two last Letters unto him; wherein the main of the Controversie between us is summed up; and though one or two passages even in those Letters also, have been already recited to make up the foregoing Scheme entire; yet the necessity thereof in that respect, will I suppose, render it sufficiently excusable to the Reader.

'Upon the whole, since according to the Doctors own concession, Baptism is not immediately intended in those Words, *Gen.* 17. 9. And it being as plain, that it cannot be remotely intended there, and that much less can it be found in any other Old Testament Text. And for as much as the Doctor hath yet nevertheless asserted, in the 10. page of his Epistle to the Reader;

That

'That in the New Teſtament no new
'rule is given by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf,
'or by his Apoſtles and followers,
'about the ſubjects of Baptiſm: I
'ſhall now therefore appeal unto the
'diſcerning Reader, whether the Do-
'ctor muſt not of neceſſity be at a
'great loſs concerning the grounds of
'Infants Baptiſm; which yet he tells
'his Reader, he hath ſo fully aſſerted,
'and that in a method wholly new,
'and upon grounds not commonly ob-
'ſerved. Indeed it cannot be denied
'to be in a method wholly new, and
'upon grounds not commonly obſer-
'ved, ſince he rejects all other Ar-
'guments as hanging it on Wyres, or
'by Geometry only. But I am apt
'to think that whatever the common
'Arguments will be found to have
'done, the Doctors new Method
'(at leaſt) doth ſufficiently appear
'to have ſo ſerved it: For if there
'be no rule given for it, either in the
'Old Teſtament, or in the New;
'then it hath no foundation in the
'Word of God at all: And if it hath
'no foundation there; the Wit of
'Man cannot acquit an action ſo

 'performed,

'performed, from the Guilt of 'Will-Worſhip; and conſequently 'from hanging it on Wyres, or by 'Geometry only.

My

My Fifth Letter to the Doctor.

Honoured Sir,

YOurs of *October* 14. hath been thus long before me; being more puzled *how* than *what* to anſwer; for I find it eaſier to anſwer what is *Argumentative* in your Papers, than how to word the juſt *reproofs* I have to lay before you, in ſuch clean, mild, decent, and Chriſtian Language, as may be fully *expreſſive* of my mind, and no way juſtly *offenſive* to yours. Reprehenſion is called by a great Divine, the Chirurgery of the Paſſions; and cutting work is not eaſie or pleaſant. Here lies then the difficulty of my Province, not to ſtir up your Paſſions, whilſt I am labouring to clear up the truth; that which relieves me in this point is, that I have to do with a generous Ad-

verſary ; *Adverſarius non Perſonæ, ſed Litis.*

Auguſtus Cæſar ſharply rebuked one that delivered a Paper to him ſo timorouſly, as if he had been reaching *ſtipem Elephanto*, a morſel to an Elephant ; but I hope I may approach you with more freedom with theſe Papers, expecting at leaſt as much humanity, and a great deal more Chriſtianity from you; whilſt I thus Animadvert on yours.

You tell me, 'My laſt was welcome to you; becauſe you learn by it, that the Controverſie long depending, and which you feared would be eternal, is not like to continue long.

By way of Reply unto which, Firſt, I give you your word *eternal* back again, as improper, and out of place here: ſure there are no ſuch litigations in eternity. Thoſe illuminated Souls that have entred that ſtate, do not miſtake three for two, and two for one, as we blind mortals do: And Secondly, whereas I perceive you are willing to end the controverſie, the ſooner the better, ſay

ſay I; ſo you end it fairly by untying, not cutting the knots that are in it. And indeed for my own part, I had rather be ſucking the Marrow of practical Truth, than exerciſing my Teeth always upon the Bones of Controverſie.

You blame me for applying the phraſes of Plain, Scriptural, Solid, and Cogent, to my own Diſcourſes; and of Chimæraes, Repugnances, doubtful Conſequences, ambiguous uncertainties, violence and corruption of Scripture (to which you might have added unproved dictates) to yours.

To which I reply, That if I did not think my own to be Scriptural, ſolid, and cogent; they ſhould be none of mine. And if it do not appear that yours are as I have called them, I will beg your pardon: But I doubt you have given too much ground in theſe, as well as your former Papers, to juſtifie thoſe Cenſures.

You put the whole Controverſie upon theſe two Iſſues, *viz.* the Duty enjoyned, *Geneſis* 17. 9.

and the ſubjects of that duty; Verſe 10.

Candidly and fairly offered (ſay I) I do accept therefore and joyn Iſſue with you, upon this reaſonable poſtulatum, that the *Engliſh* Bible may be Judge, for I pretend to no knowledg in the *Hebrew*; as alſo that you do not wreſt or cloud the genuine ſenſe by artifice or eloquence. For one of the Antients pertinently obſerves; 'That the 'ſtate and condition of the moſt 'perſpicuous truth is often obſcu-'red and altered, according to the 'ſtrength or eloquence of thoſe that 'diſpute it.

You ſay, That you have abundantly evinced that by *Seed* in the 9. Verſe, muſt be underſtood the Spiritual, as well as the Carnal Seed.

To this I reply, That that may be eaſily evinced which was never controverted. I grant you that the Spiritual Seed, *viz. Iſaac* is concerned in the 9. Verſe, but that which you are to prove, is that *Iſaac*, *quatenus*, or *as* the Spiritual Seed

Seed is there meant; I ſay this is what reſts on you to prove; elſe you only ſay, but not diſpute, and will juſtifie me in calling your Diſcourſes unproved Dictates; I expect I ſay, ſolid proof for this, becauſe it is a foundation ſtone (ſuch as it is) in your ſtructure; but I doubt this will never be proved by you. I am ſure not from the Scripture, which you palpably abuſe, by miſrendring it; In *Iſaac* ſhall *the Seed* be called; the Text ſaith not ſo, but *thy Seed.* And the Apoſtle alledging it twice in the New Teſtament ſaith, *thy Seed*, not *the Seed*, as you do, which had you done by way of expoſition only, it had been the more excuſable; but an allegation is one thing, and an expoſition is another. And we cannot be ignorant that when we cite a Scripture, we ought to cite it in the ſame ſyllables, and be preciſe to a point; foraſmuch as on every point of the Law Mountains of matter hang. Now though it is true that *Iſaac* was a type of Chriſt, and ſo of the Believing Gentiles alſo;

Iſaac

Iſaac being born after the Spirit, as a Child of the Promiſe; and not barely after the fleſh as *Iſhmael* was; yet I deny that *Iſaac* in the Spirit (that is, the Believing Gentiles) is at all to be underſtood by the Seed expreſſed in the 9. Verſe, becauſe the Seed there mentioned, is commanded in the 10. to be Circumciſed; which doth not at all ſuit with the believing Gentiles; but muſt of neceſſity be underſtood of *Abraham*'s natural poſterity by *Iſaac* only.

Nor indeed was it under that preciſe notion, as *Iſaac* was the Spiritual Seed, that the preſent obligation was at all faſtened upon him (there being nothing of this nature mentioned throughout the whole context) but rather as he was deſcended from *Abraham* according to the fleſh: for otherwiſe *Iſhmael* had been excluded from the duty there mentioned, who could pretend to nothing of any Spiritual Relation unto *Abraham* as *Iſaac* did; And yet it cannot be denied but *Iſhmael* was included.

ded therein as well as *Iſaac*.

But our buſineſs is to ſhew who were to be Circumciſed, and in what Capacity, Reſpect, and Relation, you are coming to that; and in order to it, in the next place, you aſſert a tripartite Covenant, *viz.* God on the one part: *Abraham* and his Natural Family denoted by the Word *ye*, on the ſecond part: And *Iſaac* in the Letter and Spirit, and in him the believing Gentiles, denoted by the Seed, on the third part.

You asked me before, How I durſt diſtinguiſh where God doth not? I do not know that I did; but I think you do ſo here. And ſhould I ſay no more but, *turpe eſt Doctori*, &c. it may be I had ſaid enough to that: But I pray you, dear Sir, How prove you this Covenant to be tripartite, which ſeems to be bipartite only; by Verſe 2. and Verſe 4. only *Abraham* is conſidered in it as *Pater Familias*, and his off ſpring both preſent and future taken in with him, as one party in the Covenant; even as *Noah*'s Covenant

venant is expreſſed in the ſame form, *Gen.* 9. 9. I know not what Authorities you follow, I wiſh you would be ſo juſt to your ſelf, to produce them in your own vindication; for I think you tread a very ſolitary and By-Path here. But by the ſame Rule and Reaſon you make it a tripartite Covenant, you may make it quadrupartite if you pleaſe, *viz.* God is one party, *Abraham* another, his preſent Family a third, and his Seed after him a fourth: But when a Mans Eyes are once dazled, nothing is more common than to ſee three for two, and two for one, as you here do: three Parties and two Signs, which is the next thing.

For you make two diſtinct Signs as well as three Parties in this Covenant: And that I may not abuſe you; I will ſet down *verbatim*, your own Paraphraſe upon the Words; which though you call plain and eaſie, it is to me the moſt involved, tortuous, and intricate, that ever I heard of, except *Origens Allegorical*, and *Myſtical Commentaries*: But ſuch

ſuch as it is, I ſhall here ſet it down, and my own by it, that all may judge which flows moſt naturally.

Thus runs your Paraphraſe; ſpeaking of the 9. Verſe, ſay you:

'*Therefore thou* Abraham, *and thy* '*Seed* Iſaac, in the Letter and Spirit; '*ſhall keep* (*the* ſign of) *my Cove-* '*nant.* And then ſpeaking of the 10. Verſe, you bring in that Verſe with a *But*, thus: '(But) *this is* '(the ſign of) *my Covenant which ye* 'which are now here, thou *Abraham* 'and *Iſhmael* thy Son, according to 'the fleſh, and the reſt of thy houſ-'hold here, which ſtand for all the 'Seed according to the fleſh as ſo; '*This is* (the ſign of) *my Covenant* '*which ye* (for your part) *ſhall keep* 'as a ſign of the Covenant which 'I have made *between me and ye*, '*and thy Seed* Iſaac, the Seed of the 'Promiſe, and not of the Fleſh; '*Every Man-child among ye*, ye the 'Natural Family, and Carnal Seed '*ſhall be Circumciſed*; among ye, 'he

'he doth not ſay among the Seed. 'The Seed is to keep the Covenant 'in a ſign, Verſe 9. But the natural 'Family only are to keep it in *this* 'ſign of Circumciſion. *Thou ſhalt* '*keep my Covenant therefore* (in the 'ſign of it) *thou and thy Seed:* (but) '*this is my Covenant which ye ſhall* '*keep*, &c. *Every Man-child ſhall be* 'Circumciſed.

My Paraphraſe.

I enter into Covenant with thee *Abraham*, and with thine; in which Covenant I confer upon thee and them, all ſorts of Bleſſings, Spiritual and Temporal; Temporal upon thy Natural Seed, and Spiritual and Temporal on thy Spiritual Seed. And by way of reſtipulation, I require, That both thou in thy own perſon, and they in theirs, both thoſe that are preſent and future, keep my Covenant: And becauſe thou mayeſt underſtand what I require of you; this is my Covenant, (*i. e.*) the ſign of it to thee and them in their Generation, which thou

thou and they ſhall keep; *Every Male among you ſhall be Circumciſed.* This is the plain and obvious ſenſe.

Your Paraphraſe is two wayes faulty: For firſt it is forced, not natural, nor obvious. And Secondly, it is repugnant both to the Text and to it ſelf. Firſt to the Text, in forcing one ſign upon it more than it ever intended, *viz.* Baptiſm. Secondly, to it ſelf and the Text too: For if the Natural Seed were to keep it in *this* ſign, *viz.* in Circumciſion, and the Spiritual Seed in *the* ſign, *viz.* in Baptiſm, and *Iſaac* be the Spiritual Seed; then it follows, if *Iſaac* ſuſtain only the capacity and relation of the Spiritual Seed, he ought not to be Circumciſed, which he was; if of the Natural and Spiritual Seed too, (as you make him) he ſhould be both Circumciſed and Baptized alſo, which he was not. Yea according to your reckoning, *Abraham* himſelf, as well as *Iſaac*, ſhould have been Baptized: For if the ſign in the 9. Verſe, be Baptiſm, as you intimate;

intimate; the obligation there is on *Abraham* and *Iſaac* too; as well as on the Seed in the Goſpel-day: For thus runs your own Paraphraſe upon the Words, 'Therefore 'thou *Abraham* and *thy* Seed *Iſaac* in 'the Letter and Spirit ſhall keep the 'ſign of my Covenant, that is, both *he* and *they*, and *thou* alſo, muſt be baptized.

It is true, the true ſenſe of the Words, we all know (or ſhould know at leaſt) is this; *Thou ſhalt keep my Coveuant therefore, thou and thy Seed*: That is, both thou and they ſhall be Circumciſed; as the 10. Verſe declares: And ſo the Words run ſmooth, without jarring, ſuitable to the plain ſcope of the Spirit of God in the following words: But according to the courſe that you take, I do not ſee for my own part, how you can poſſibly avoid the abſurdity, but that the ſenſe muſt be plainly this; Thou, even thou *Abraham* ſhalt be Baptized; as alſo thy Seed *Iſaac* in the *Letter*, together with thy Seed *Iſaac* in the *Spirit* (or thy Spiritual Seed

Seed in the Goſpel-day,) as the proper ſign of that Covenant, which I have now made both with thee and them.

But I muſt a little further manifeſt what I but now hinted alſo, concerning your forcing one ſign upon the Text, more than it ever intended, *viz.* Baptiſm; which is indeed the foundation of the foregoing abſurdity: For you tell me of *the* ſign in the 9. Verſe. And *this* ſign in the 10. *the* ſign in the 9. Verſe, relating, ſay you, to the Believing Gentiles: And *this* ſign in the 10. to the natural poſterity of *Abraham*: But pray hold there, Sir, we muſt not be put off ſo. For as far as I can diſcern, God ſpeaks but of one ſign in both Verſes. I acknowledge, as you ſay, 'That the ſenſe and meaning of 'the Phraſe of keeping the Cove-'nant in either Verſe, is clearly the 'meaning of it alſo in both. And 'therefore to keep the Covenant 'in the 9 Verſe, is to keep the ſign 'of the Covenant, ſeeing to keep 'the Covenant in the 10. Verſe, is

to

'to keep it in the ſign; but then we muſt not make two ſigns, where God ſpeaks but of one. It cannot be rationally denied (as your ſelf do now ſeem to grant) but that the words in the 10. Verſe, are only exegetical of thoſe in the 9. and then where are the two ſigns you ſpeak of? No, Sir, we can allow of no Rules of Addition, or Multiplication, at this rate, when we come to interpret the Word of God; for that is, as I have already told you, highly dangerous. It is true, twice one makes two; *a* ſign or *the* ſign in the 9. and *this* ſign in the 10. that is, a ſign of Gods appointment in the 10. and another of your own deviſing in the 9. But certainly this kind of courſe will not do, and the miſtake by this time, I ſuppoſe, is diſcernable enough; only I muſt tell you, that as far as I can apprehend, it was your over earlineſs in giving the ſenſe of the 9. Verſe, that hath led you into the preſent error; for had you waited Gods leiſure, and tarried till God himſelf had

had ſpoken, as he doth in the 10. Verſe, by way of explication of thoſe general words in the 9. you had not run into that fatal miſtake as now you do, of making two ſigns where God makes but one; and conſequently of adding a ſign of your own, to that of Gods appointment.

As I take it, one of the Schoolmen ſaith, That if the Workmans Hand were his Rule, he could never err in working. And if what you pleaſe to paraphraſe on a Text, muſt be the ſenſe, you cannot fail to carry any cauſe you undertake: for after this rate a man of an ordinary capacity may undertake to prove *Quidlibet à Quolibet*; what himſelf pleaſes from any Text whatſoever. But really Sir, this is not to interpret, but to wreſt the Scriptures. 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. that is, To put them on the rack to force them to ſpeak what they never meant. * You will bear with my plainneſs herein, the merit of the cauſe lies in it; and your attempt to force the Scriptures, as you

* To which I may juſtly add, what the Wiſe man ſaith, Prov. 30. 5. 6.

you do, is no ſmall evil. Thus Sir, your *foundation* fails, and *debile fundamentum fallit opus*: All the reſt you have ſo artificially ſuperſtructed, totters of courſe. I ſhall now therefore animadvert upon only one word more in your Paraphraſe, (though more might be ſpoken to) and ſo proceed to anſwer the ſeveral Queſtions you propound unto me;

And that is the Word, *But*; in reſpect of which I pray you to tell me by what Authority we ſhall be aſſured, that the words in the 10. Verſe, are indeed to be interpreted disjunctively, as you do ſuggeſt, while you begin that verſe with a *But*, as you do in your Paraphraſe thereon? (*but*) ſay you, this is the ſign, *&c.* Whereas there is no ſuch Word in the Text, nor any thing like it that I can meet with. Indeed you could never expect to carry the cauſe you plead for, but by the addition of this disjunctive word, *But*, in the beginning of the 10. Verſe, where there was none before: For thus run the

the Words in their naked ſimplicity, according to the commonly received Tranſlation of them. *Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed*, &c. Verſe 9. And then Verſe 10. *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep*, &c. But you have thought fit to add this Word, *But*, in the beginning of the 10. Verſe, to make it run the more plauſibly to your own ſenſe (which it would not do without) whereby you would inſinuate as if God directed his ſpeech to another ſort of perſons there than in the 9. and indeed if that word had been added by the unerring Spirit of God, the words in both Verſes, would clearly enough have had quite another ſenſe, than now they have: But as the caſe ſtands, that word muſt be expunged; for as far as I can ſee, there is no reaſon why it ſhould be put in: God doth not ſay ſo; and therefore why ſhould you.

And now Sir, having run through your Paraphraſe, I come to the Queſtions you propounded, which are

are grounded thereupon. In my Anſwer whereunto, I muſt have an eye to your Paraphraſe, becauſe I find the one is made to fortifie and give life unto the other. Accordingly I ſhall reſpect both in my Anſwers.

Quer. 1. And Firſt, you demand, Is there not a Word, not a ſyllable, as you expreſs it (ſay you) in the 17. of *Geneſis*, that the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham* are to keep the Covenant in the ſign of it?

Sol. I Anſwer, That this Phraſe, *the ſign*, is equivocal. According to you, it is Baptiſm; according to my ſenſe, and the plain Scripture, it is Circumciſion. That *Iſaac* and all believers of the Old Teſtament, lineally deſcending from *Abraham*, were obliged to keep the Covenant in Circumciſion, the declared and determinate ſign of it, I grant. That there is any other ſign, beſides that in this 17. Chapter, I deny; and you have not offered the leaſt proof for it, beſides your own Paraphraſe upon the Words; which is to dictate, not to diſpute.

You

You demand; Have not I proved that the Seed there is *Isaac* in the Spirit principally? *Qu.* 2.

If by *Isaac* in the Spirit you mean the believing Gentiles; I Answer, No: but I have rather proved the contrary; to wit, that the Seed there mentioned is to be understood of *Abraham*'s Natural Posterity by *Isaac* only. And the reason is plain, because the Seed mentioned in the 9. Verse, are expresly commanded in the 10. to be Circumcised; which doth not at all relate unto the Believing Gentiles, but must of necessity be understood of *Abraham*'s Natural Posterity only. *Sol.*

That the Holy Ghost under the New Testament makes *Isaac* a figure of Christ, and of them that are born after the Spirit, I deny not. But that *Abraham* as well as *Ishmael*, should in this place stand for the Carnal Seed, and *Isaac* for the Spiritual Seed only; as your Question implies, and your Paraphrase expresses; and that *Abraham*, *Ishmael*, and the rest of the

present Family, as standing for the Carnal Seed, should be here contradistinguished to *Isaac* in the keeping of this Covenant in the sign on it; is what you have not, and I presume never will be able to prove. This Phrase *the Seed*, as it stands in your Question, would indeed intimate such a contradistinction, *the Seed* being an emphatical expression; but there is no such word in the Text, as *the Seed*; however you have adventured to put it in, as more suiting your turn, than those Words the Holy Ghost was pleased to use in this 9. Verse, *thy Seed*. The Text puts them in conjunction in the same Promise and Obligation; you in contradistinction, and accordingly alter the Phrase, to ground your notion upon it: But did *Abraham* in the business of Circumcision stand indeed for the Carnal Seed, as you say, as well as *Ishmael*; How then did he receive Circumcision as a Seal of the righteousness of Faith?

Doth

Doth not God, say you, distinguish between *ye* and *the Seed*? And is not Circumcision enjoyned only on the Natural, Carnal Family of *Abraham*', in the term *ye*, as it is distinguished from *the Seed*? *Qu.* 3.

No, there is no such distinction, but of your own making. The terms of every distinction must be opposite, else it is no distinction; but here they are conjoyned as one party in the Obligation. And *the Seed* which you would make one member of the distinction, is a self created term, as I have told you upon the former Question. It is *thou* and *thy Seed* after thee in the 9. Verse, pointing not only at *Isaac*, but at all *Abraham*'s posterity in their respective Generations, during the continuance of that Administration. And then it follows in the 10. Verse, *This is my Covenant which ye shall keep*, &c. meaning *Abraham* and his Seed after him in their Generations, which had been spoken of just before; so that God doth not distinguish between *Sol.*

ye and *the Seed*; as you ſay he doth: Nor doth it appear that Circumciſion is enjoyned only on the Natural, Carnal Family of *Abraham*, in the term *ye*, as it is diſtinguiſhed from *the Seed*; but rather the contrary.

Obj. But then you do alſo tell me, That the ſubject of the Obligation to Circumciſion in particular, which is in the 10. Verſe, is altered; it is not there, ſay you, *Thou and thy Seed*, as all along before; but *ye*, and *ye* is *Abraham*, and thoſe then with him in the Letter: But *Iſaac* was not there, who was the promiſed Seed.

Sol. Could Gods mind, I pray you, be more fitly expreſſed in the ſenſe I have pleaded for, than to ſay, *This is my Covenant which* ye *ſhall keep*, in the 10. Verſe, meaning *Abraham* and his Seed after him, ſpoken of in the 9. It is true, the Words *thee* or *thou* are not to be found in the 10. Verſe, nor was it fit they ſhould; for it would have been altogether improper to have ſaid in the 10. Verſe, *This*

is

is my Covenant which thou *ſhalt keep between me and you*, &c. becauſe God intended that his Covenant ſhould be kept by more than one; even by the Seed of *Abraham* before mentioned, as well as by *Abraham* himſelf: And therefore it is moſt fitly expreſſed as it is, in purſuance of the ſenſe I have pleaded for, *This is my Covenant which* ye *ſhall keep*, &c.

And whereas you tell me, That *ye* is *Abraham*, and thoſe then with him in the Letter; but *Iſaac* was not there, who was the Promiſed Seed. What do you drive at in this expreſſion? would you have me believe, as your words do ſeem to import, that *Iſaac* the Promiſed Seed was not to be Circumciſed, becauſe he was not there when the command of that kind was given to *Abraham* and the reſt then preſent with him in the Letter? It is true, *Iſaac* was not then preſent with him, as being not yet born; but yet he was as much comprehended in the term *ye*, as *Abraham* himſelf; for the com-

mand in the 9. Verſe, concerned the Seed of *Abraham* as much as *Abraham* himſelf; and therefore ſo doth the term *ye* in the 10.

Qu. 4. Again, (ſay you) Why doth God diſtinguiſh the *ye*, from *the Seed* [*between me and ye and thy Seed*] by which I ſuppoſe you mean thoſe words in the latter part of the 10. Verſe.

Sol. I anſwer, That as far as appears to me, God doth not diſtinguiſh the *ye* from *the Seed*, except as one was preſent, the other future; but both together making one party in Covenant. *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy Seed after thee*, &c. For I have already proved, that *ye*, in the beginning of this Verſe, muſt of neceſſity comprehend all thoſe that had been before mentioned in the foregoing Verſe; that is, *Abraham and his Seed after him in their Generations*: But then whereas God ſaith; *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep* between me and you: This can be underſtood in my opinion, no otherwiſe

wiſe than thus, *Between me and you*; that is, Between me, and thou *Abraham*, together with thy Son *Iſhmael*, and the reſt of the Family now preſent with thee: and not only between me and you now preſent; but *between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee*, before expreſſed; *Every Man-child among you ſhall be Circumciſed.*

In fine, (ſay you) why all along in the 10. and 11. Verſes, and afterward both in the impoſition of Circumciſion, and in the intimation of the end and uſe of it, doth the Holy Ghoſt uſe a reſtrictive term, and never mentions *the Seed*; *but ye, ye ſhall keep it*, &c. *And it ſhall be a token between me and ye*; he ſaith not, *the Seed ſhall keep it*, &c. nor, *That it ſhall be a token to the Seed.* He ſayes, *The Seed ſhall keep the Covenant* [*in a ſign*] but doth not ſay, *it ſhall keep the Covenant in* this *ſign*; *it ſhall keep a ſign*, not this *ſign*; And why ſo? clear up theſe Queſtions (ſay you) and you do ſomething; and without it all is nothing. Qu. 5.

Sol. The reaſon then (ſay I) Why in the beginning of the 10. Verſe, and afterward, both in the impoſition of Circumciſion, and in the intimation of the end and uſe of it, the Holy Ghoſt doth uſe a reſtrictive term; is, becauſe it would have been improper ſo often to have repeated the word *Seed*, (according to the uſual forms of ſpeech generally in cuſtome among men) it being enough when *Abraham and his Seed after him*, had been once or twice mentioned, to ſay *ye*, as there was further occaſion to make mention of them; he needed not afterward to ſay, *The Seed ſhould keep*, &c. Nor that it ſhould be a token to *the Seed*: *But* ye *ſhall keep it*, &c. *And it ſhall be a token to you.*

But whereas you tell me, That God ſays, *the Seed ſhall keep the Covenant*, [in *a* Sign] But doth not ſay, *it ſhall keep the Covenant in* this *ſign*; *it ſhall keep* a *ſign*, *not* this *ſign*, And why ſo?

I anſwer, That God doth not ſay, *That Abraham or his Seed ſhould keep the Covenant* [*in a ſign*] nor in *this* ſign; nor indeed in *any ſign* diſtinct from that which is expreſly mentioned in the 10. Verſe. *viz. The ſign of Circumciſion*; for that is the only ſign ſpoken of, or ſo much as hinted at, in that whole Chapter: And therefore for you to make two ſigns where God ſpeaks but of one, as I have already told you, is no ſmall tranſgreſſion. The ground of which miſtake, ſeems to have been your over haſtineſs in giving the ſenſe of the 9. Verſe, before the proper ſeaſon; whereas you ſhould have waited till God himſelf had ſpoken, as he doth to that purpoſe in the following words; but by this means (your interpretation and Gods being put together, though yours was needleſs while Gods was in place) on a ſudden up ſtarts the appearance of a double incumbence, where but one was intended.

Laſtly, you demand, Is not the ſame the ſubject in the obliga- *Qu. 6.*

tion in the 9. Verſe, that is, in the promiſe Spiritual in the 7. and temporal in the 8. ?

Sol. Yes, and the ſame that is in the 10. alſo; that is, *Abraham* and all his, whether preſent or future, Carnal, or Spiritual, were concerned ſome way or other. In the Bleſſings temporal, the Carnal Seed were concerned. In the Bleſſings Spiritual and Temporal, the Believing Seed of *Abraham* were concerned. And both the one and the other were alſo concerned in the Obligation mentioned Verſe 9. (*i. e.*) to be *Circumciſed*, as the 10. Verſe declares. And it is plain that *Iſaac* as well as *Iſhmael*; the Believing Jews as well as the Carnal, were conſtantly Circumciſed; and not one to keep it in one ſign, and another in another, as you ſuggeſt without any ground from this Text.

But to leave as little matter as may be for further ventilation; though I do acknowledg that *Iſaac* was a figure of thoſe born after the Spirit: And that the Believing Gentiles,

Gentiles, as *Iſaac* was, are the Children of the Promiſe. And though I do alſo acknowledge that ſince the taking down of the partition-Wall by the death of Chriſt, the believing Jews and the believing Gentiles are no more diſtinguiſhed, and of different Seeds, as many, or diverſe, but are made one in Chriſt: Yet I deny that the Holy Ghoſt in this Text points at any New Teſtament ſign, with which the Spiritual Seed were to be ſigned in the Goſpel-day: their obligation to wear the Goſpel ſign, being wholly left unto the time of its inſtitution; which determines both the ſubjects and duties thereof.

And therefore though it cannot be denyed, but that *Abraham*, being in Covenant with God himſelf, was expreſly commanded not only to wear the ſign of it himſelf; but to put it upon his Children alſo: And not only ſo, but on his Servants, Slaves and all; yet you can produce no command to this purpoſe under the Goſpel in reſpect of

Baptiſm.

Baptiſm. I know very well this is the point you drive at: But as you have yet produced no Scripture proof for the maintenance of your aſſertion of this kind, but *Gen.* 17. 9. ſo I have already proved, that thoſe words concern the Natural poſterity of *Abraham* only. And though *Abraham's* being in Covenant was a ſufficient ground for him at the command of God to put the ſign of it upon his off-ſpring alſo; whether believers or no: Yet it is expreſly required that the perſons to be Baptized be Believers themſelves; for thus runs the Goſpel Commiſſion, *Mark.* 16. 16. *He that believeth and is Baptized, ſhall be ſaved.* And ſo *Acts* 8. *If thou believeſt with all thine heart, thou mayeſt,* &c. Which qualification was not required of thoſe to be Circumciſed, as the condition thereof, whether of Infants or thoſe at Age; ſo that now it is not enough to ſay as the Jews did in *John's* time; *We have Abraham to our Father:* But thoſe to be Baptized, muſt make (at leaſt) a profeſſion

feſſion of Faith and Repentance ; themſelves, before they can be duly admitted thereunto. And therefore to Baptize Infants that are uncapable of either, is no other than to croſs the Goſpel Rule. And I could never yet meet with two Rules in reference to Baptiſm, one relating to Infants, and another to thoſe of Age ; but that which relates to the adult only ; and conſequently unto ſuch alone as are capable of the terms which the Goſpel now requires.

And indeed, if it were granted that the believing Gentiles are intended as the proper ſubject of the Obligation, mentioned *Gen.* 17. 9. Yet you cannot from thoſe Words ſubſtantially prove that the Infant Seed of Believers are to be Baptized with their Parents : For there God only ſaith, *Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations* : And that is all. There is no mention in that Text, of putting the ſign on their Children alſo, as was the caſe in *Abraham*'s time. It is true by

by the Seed there ſpoken of you underſtand the Spiritual Seed in the Goſpel-day; and by keeping the Covenant you underſtand their keeping it in the proper ſign of it, belonging to the Goſpel, that is, Baptiſm: but where lies the ground for Infant Baptiſm in all this? For if we exempt *Abraham* as not being at all concerned in the Goſpel Obligation, which you ſay is there intended; and allow that it hath relation only to the Spiritual Seed in the Goſpel-day; let thoſe then that are ſuch, when they deſire it, be Baptized: But is there a word or ſyllable there concerning the *Infant Seed* of believers, that they alſo muſt be Baptized? Or muſt we forge a commiſſion out of our own Brain to this purpoſe, where the Scripture it ſelf is ſilent? Let the Spiritual Seed then keep the Covenant in the proper ſign of it in their own perſons; and when you can produce any teſtimony from the Scriptures, that, becauſe Believers themſelves are in Covenant, their Infants muſt now be ſigned alſo; I hope we ſhall not fail to be conformable

formable to the Divine Precept. But for you to pretend to a plain, downright, Scripture proof for Infant Baptiſm from the words inſiſted on; as far as I can ſee, while the World ſtands, you will never be able to make good what you would pretend unto upon that account.

Thus having ſtated the Iſſues on which the thing in controverſy between us now depends; and having anſwered your Queſtions, I hope I may alſo take the boldneſs to ſay, That I have done it with the candor and fairneſs that becomes a ſeeker of truth; and ſhall therefore ſtill beg of God to lead both you and me into the way of all truth, that the remaining darkneſs on your mind or on mine, in our preſent ſearches after it, may at length be diſpelled. Thus reſteth,

Honoured Sir,

Dartm. Dec. 15. 1682. *Yours in all Chriſtian Service and Affection,*

Philip Cary.

My

My Sixth and laſt Letter, which was never yet anſwered.

Honoured Sir,

I find your laſt of a different complexion and ſtile from your former; abounding with ſarcaſms, Jeers, and opprobrious terms; and all ſtrangely connected with pretences of candor, lenity, and ſoft Words, and that you dare not allow your ſelf ſuch a liberty as I take in this kind. At this I am aſtoniſhed, and provoke you to ſhew one opprobrious term applied to your perſon in all my Papers. Your perſon I honour, when I cenſure and detect your miſtakes.

miſtakes. But I ſee it is time to turn the Cask upon its Head, when its come to the Bottom, and runs ſo foul and dreggy. I know no uſe of ſcoffs in Controverſie, but to diſtract an Adverſary, and fill up the defects of ſound Reaſon.

I perceive you are very angry with me for telling you; That when a mans Eyes are once dazled, nothing is more common than to ſee three for two, and two for one, as you do; but I hope you will readily grant that it is incident to the wiſeſt man on earth at ſome turns to have his Eyes dazled, unto a misjudgment and miſapprehenſion both of things and perſons. And I hope you do not reckon your ſelf the only infallible man in the World, but that it is poſſible even for you to have your Eyes dazled ſometimes as well as others. And therefore unleſs you reckon your ſelf above the reach of humane imperfections, I ſee no juſt reaſon you have to be offended at ſuch a reflection as that was.

I have indeed in divers other paſſages of my laſt Letter, uſed a Chriſtian freedom with you, which ſeems greatly to ſtartle you; but if you will be offended at a ſerious, Chriſtian reprehenſion, becauſe it is of a cutting nature, *Heb.* 4. 12. I cannot help that; and therefore though you condemn it as Butcher-like, I ſhall more willingly bear the unjuſt imputation of ſuch a cenſure, than be really guilty thereof, as you ſeem to be in yours. But you could not give a more convincing evidence of the weakneſs of the cauſe you are ingaged in, than by being forced to fly unto the uſe of ſuch kind of Weapons for the defence thereof; certainly ſofter Words, and harder Arguments would have been more proper for you.

Your Anſwer I have conſidered both in the whole, and in its parts. In the whole it ſeems to me, one great impertinence; repeating what had been anſwered before; and ſliding by the ſubſtantial part of my former and latter Anſwers; faſtening

ſtening only upon ſome by-expreſſions (which yet I am ready to vindicate) as fit ſubjects for your pleaſant fancy to expoſe me to contempt and laughter. But this ſtirs no other paſſion in me but pity toward you, that herein act beneath your ſelf: and I would have it leave no other effect or impreſſion on me, but humility; who am all that you call me, and much more; and deſire to be vile in my own Eyes before the Lord, though I have not deſerved this uſage from you.

But to the parts of your anſwer: You begin it with a collation of my Papers of the 29. of *September*, and my laſt; and fancy that at firſt glance you have found a contradiction in them. Upon which ſuppoſal you ſet your foot upon me, and thus inſult; who is it now that is dazled?

Your ſelf ſtill (ſay I) for you fancy to ſee what is not in theſe papers. I had ſaid in the former; That the Text, *Gen.* 17. 9. mentions no ſign at all, or gives the leaſt hint *Reply.*

hint of any: and ſo I ſay ſtill, there is no ſuch term, or a ſyllable of that ſound in the Text: but ſay you, in mine of the 15. of *December*, I acknowledge one ſign: True, I do ſo, as included in the ſenſe, though not expreſſed in the terms. And ſo doth *Junius* in his Note upon that place, *Fœdus metonymicè pro fœderis Symbolo.* And if in this you find a contradiction, your triumph hath ſome footing, elſe all the mirth is marred, and my modeſty ſalved. I am where I was: no ſign mentioned at all in the 9. Verſe, and but one that is or can be allowed in the ſenſe of that whole context.

As for my ſlipperineſs in your next Paragraph, and a ſoft place in my Head; it is well my ſoft head can find a fair way for me to ſlip from betwixt your fingers, when you thought you had caught me in a contradiction, and inſulted ſo loudly in that conceit. But, Sir, you may ſooner find two ſoft places in my Head, than two ſigns in that context.

Your

Your triumph being ended upon that; you preſently find another as bad as the former, ſetting my two papers a ſcuffling again, about another contradiction. For, ſay you, in my former Paper, I underſtand by the Spiritual Seed, Chriſt and the believing Gentiles; but in this, the perſon of *Iſaac*.

Who that ſhall read my laſt Paper, would think that ever you had read what here you undertake to anſwer? Sir, you abuſe me in this, by a miſrepreſentation of my plain Words and Senſe: For I tell you in my laſt, that I acknowledg *Iſaac* was a Figure of thoſe born after the Spirit; and that the believing Gentiles as *Iſaac* was, are the Children of the Promiſe. Had this been heeded, all the pains you take in your firſt page, to evince *Iſaac* to be a figure of the Spiritual Seed, might have been ſpared; for it is what I have plainly acknowledged; though it be nothing to your advantage; except you could have proved your two ſigns; and that *Iſaac* in *the* ſign, *Rep.*

ſign, was a repreſentative of the Gentile believers, who therefore with all theirs muſt be baptized, as *Iſaac* was. All that deſerves to be remarqued further in your firſt page, is, that grave and worthy note, with which you cloſe it, and for which I thank you. 'That to ſtart a ſenſe of the 'Spiritual Seed which was not 'thought of before, is doubling. 'And a Hare is uſed to double when 'near run down.

Rep. Your Note is weighty, and the Hare you hunt is not ſo near run down, but that ſhe will double once more; and double your own words upon you too: Have not you ſtarted a new ſenſe of *Gen.* 17. which was never thought of by any Father or Commentator before; no Author ever going in your track, but purely novel? And is not this according to your own obſervation, doubling? Really Sir, you convince me, that harder and ſteadier Heads than mine, may now and then nod and forget themſelves.

But

But from fishing for more contradictions, you fall in the next place, 'a lamenting your misfortune in having to do with such 'an Adversary, who being prejudiced in adherence to an opinion 'long ago conceived, is obliged to 'do all things to maintain it; with 'such a one as is not susceptible 'of light; yea with such a one as 'being prepossessed, winds and 'turns, and wriggles, and will not 'admit of plain sense. In a word, 'one that will not see that thrice 'one makes three. That is neither 'consistent with himself, or his 'principles, a *Proteus*, a capering '*Will with a Wisp*, an *ignis fatuus*; which in effect is no other than a soft-headed Fool. And all this vomited out at one gush, by a man that in the very next words, wipes his Mouth, and professeth he dare not allow himself such a liberty as I do; that holds it undecent, and unchristian to sharpen his Pen; and calls him a Butcher rather than a Chirurgeon that delights in cutting, and tearing, and slashing, when there

there is no need of it; that commends ſoft Words and hard Arguments; when mean while ſoft Words are as great a rarity as hard Arguments, in all theſe your Papers, except theſe be ſuch.

But what need you ſo to bewail your misfortune? though I am not an Adverſary conſiderable enough for you to raiſe your honour upon; yet I am one of your own chuſing and provoking; and the ſofter and ſimpler you find me, the eaſier will your victory and triumph over me be; only perhaps you reckon it inglorious to enter the liſts with ſuch a contemptible thing as I am.

No generous Eagle ſtoopeth from on high,
To truſs a Titmouſe, *or a* Butter-fly.

Thus *Goliah* deſpiſed that poor Stripling that came againſt him with a ſtaff, and a ſtone. An Elephant ſcorns to fight a Mouſe; yet Sacred Story tells us the event of the one,

one, and Prophane Hiſtory of the other; which I ſpeak not in a way of boaſting, but to let you know that you do not well thus to hector me with ſuch kind of language as you do.

In your next Paragraph you fall ſeverely upon me, for noting your fault in corrupting the Text, by changing *thy Seed* for *the Seed*: the latter being more emphatical, and fit for your purpoſe. In your defence whereof it is very obſervable how you twiſt, wind, and turn (to apply your own Phraſes); for firſt you charge it as a miſtake in your Scribe; but after it had been denyed, then charged as an errour in the Scribe: Leſt you ſhould ſeem to err, you undertake the defence of the before acknowledged miſtake, with a *Quod ſcripſi, ſcripſi.* But is this becoming the candor and ingenuity of your character? Who is it now Sir, that is obliged to do all things to defend his Opinion? to ſay and unſay, deny, and defend the ſame things? We need not *Argus*'s hun-

dred Eyes; ſo dull a fellow as I am, diſcerns this ſhuffling with half an Eye.

And though this courſe be bad in you, and the worſe becauſe you before condemned it (though unjuſtly in me) yet the *medium* you have choſen to defend that alteration of the Text, is a greater crime than to let it paſs as the Scribe's miſtake: for you tell me that Chriſt and his Apoſtles did thus in an hundred places. A ſorry help at a dead lift! How hard is the caſe now with you, that you are forced to ſuch a ſhift as this? Chriſt and his Apoſtles were infallible; are you ſo too? Every variation they made was Authentick, and Canonical Scripture; are yours ſo too? Dare you compare? If you have equal authority, we know where to find an infallible Judge of all controverſies on Earth, nearer home than *Rome*: though I believe *John Duns* (*Scotus*) never heard of any beſides him that wears the Triple Crown.

But to our buſineſs, ſay you (it is time to come to the buſineſs, ſay I, for all this while you have been beſide it): and therefore now I expect ſoft Words and hard Arguments. I therefore diligently attend your next Paragraph, wherein you ſay the main of the Controverſie lieth. Here you make uſe of my conceſſion; That the Spiritual as well as the Carnal Seed, *Iſaac* as well as *Iſhmael*, are concerned in thoſe Verſes in *Gen.* 17. 8, 9, 10.

Rep. It is true they were ſo; both the one and the other were to be Circumciſed; but not *quatenus* Spiritual: but as the Seed, or natural deſcendents of *Abraham*. But this ſay you is a *Bull*: if ſo, you had need beware, for Bulls have Horns, and will puſh; and ſo will this. For,

If the proper ſubjects of Circumciſion were the Spiritual Seed, *quatenus* Spiritual; then none but the Spiritual Seed ought to be Circumciſed; whereas *Iſhmael* and thouſands more that were not the

Spiritual Seed of *Abraham* were; and ought to be Circumciſed.

But ſay you, though *Iſaac* was Circumciſed, and *Iſhmael* too; yet there are two ſigns in that Text, Circumciſion and Baptiſm. And therefore though *Iſaac* in the Letter was to be Circumciſed, as the Natural off-ſpring of *Abraham*; yet *Iſaac* (ſay you) was both in the Promiſe and in the *Obligation* too, to be conſidered as he *repreſents* the Believing Gentiles, the true Spiritual Seed. And thus alſo runs your Paraphraſe upon the words, as it is expreſſed in your former Paper. 'This is the ſign of my Co-'venant, which ye for your part 'ſhall keep; as a ſign of the Co-'venant I have made between me 'and you, and thy Seed *Iſaac*, the 'Seed of the Promiſe and not of 'the Fleſh; *Every Man-child among* '*ye*, ye the natural Family and 'Carnal Seed, ſhall be Circumciſed. '*Among ye*; he doth not ſay a-'mong the Seed. The Seed is to 'keep the Covenant in *a* ſign, 'Verſe 9. But the Natural Fami-'ly

'ly only are to keep it in *this* ſign
'of Circumciſion.

What pity is it that no man in the World ſhould be able to ſee this beſides your ſelf? I before acknowledged *Iſaac* to be a type, or figure of the Believing Gentiles; but not in Baptiſm, but in the way and manner of his ſupernatural birth, to which our regeneration in ſome ſort correſponds; as you well expound to this purpoſe, *Rom.* 4. 13, 16, 17. but that there is any ſuch ſign as Baptiſm in *Gen.* 17. And that *Iſaac* was ſigned by it as a Type or Figure of the Gentile Believers (as you now ſeem to affirm, and your Paraphraſe imports) I deny, and never expect with all your Art and Sophiſtry to ſee evinced. And indeed you make him a ſtrange Type of the Gentile Believers in point of Baptiſm, if he himſelf were not Baptized, nor ſuch an Ordnance as Baptiſm, at that time inſtituted; he was a type of that which neither was, in it ſelf, nor paſſed upon him. As to any conceſſions of mine, you have *Rep.*

your liberty to make what uſe you pleaſe of them. If I have by inadvertency dropt any word repugnant to this ſenſe (as I know not that I have) evince it, and my recantation ſhall be your ſatisfaction. In ſumm; I own *Iſaac* to be a type of the Believing Gentiles in the point of the ſupernatural birth. I deny him to be ſo in the point of Baptiſm; and deſire you among all the types in Scripture to ſhew one like this you plead for, that he ſhould repreſent us in the Ordnance of Baptiſm, when he himſelf was never Baptized, nor ſuch an Ordnance in being for many hundred years after his death.

But whereas you tell me, 'That 'you have mentioned a conceſſion 'of mine in a former Letter, and 'leſt I ſhould either forget it, or 'ſhould by ſome *evaſion* which you 'cannot think of, *elevate* the force 'of it, and ſo create you new 'trouble hereafter; you will cite the paſſage now, *&c.*

To

To this I reply, That the paſſage you now cite, being as little to your purpoſe as the former; I ſhall only therefore tell you; That I ſtudy no evaſions to *elevate* the force of what I have ſaid; I ſuppoſe that word was the fault of your Scribe too: But for all that you may juſtifie it for ought I know; but if you mean *elude*, I muſt ſay, I need no evaſions either to *elude* the force of my own conceſſions, or to *elevate* the force of yours.

And now, ſay you, it is time to tell you what Authors I follow, they are Scriptural ones, ſuch as *Paul*, *&c.*

There are few errors in Theologie, but pretend to Scripture Authority. Sir, our buſineſs now is the Expoſition of a Text. And *Paul* never told you of two ſigns and three parties in that Covenant. If he doth, I deſire you to produce him for it, and he ſhall be more to me than a thouſand Authorities: I ſay, ſhew me that Text where *Paul* tells you of two ſigns *Rep.*

in that Covenant; the one Baptiſm, the other Circumciſion; or that *Abraham* was to repreſent the Carnal Seed, and *Iſaac* the Spiritual. *Paul* I have read, and *Peter* too; but whence your notion is, I cannot tell. I think he was as much a ſtranger to it as I and all others, both Antient and Moderns, were, before you were pleaſed to gratifie the world with this new light.

You come again, p. 5. with your pinching and amazing diſtinction, as you call it, of *ye* and *the Seed*, to make the Covenant tripartite.

Rep. I thought I had ſaid enough to that before; that thoſe terms do diſtinguiſh the preſent and future Seed of *Abraham*; but not as two diſtinct parties in the Covenant, but as different perſons; both being but one party, though ſome were preſent, others future. For this you upbraid me, and ſay this is to affirm and deny the ſame thing. But how can you ſay or think ſo? And why do you abuſe your ſelf as well as me in ſo affirming?

firming? Good Sir, uſe your reaſon and ingenuity to better purpoſe. May not many perſons, though ſome be preſent, others abſent, be all one party in Covenant, without a contradiction? Let *Deut.* 29. from the 10. to the 16. decide that.

But for this and no other reaſon, you judge my head to be unſetled. If ſo, it is well for me, I am in an able Doctors hand, you have skill, and I have Hellebore; but bleſſed be God there is no need for either yet.

From one abſurdity you ſtrive to run me into another, deriding me for affirming that the members of a diſtinction ought to be oppoſite.

What ſhall I now do? I am no *Rep.* Academick, but a poor, ſilly, Countrey fellow, and in the hands of a learned Doctor, at whoſe Feet I ſhould rather ſit, than dare to diſpute a Point of Logick. This you ſay is *new*; a *new light*; but that I hope will not offend you; your whole notion being ſo, a new

light altogether, your Expoſition of *Geneſis* 17. being ſuch as no man before you, ever made on that Text. But though that were anſwer enough *ad hominem*; it will not juſtifie me who cenſure you for *novelty*. This put me to my ſhifts, and made me inquiſitive after ſome Syſtems of Logick; and I have found two, if they be of any credit with you, *viz.* *Stierius*, *Cap.* 6. *Reg.* 3. who ſaith, *Omnia membra dividentia debent inter ſeſe pugnare.* Are fighters oppoſites? And Doctor *Sanderſon*, who ſaith, *Compend. Log. p.* 68. *Membra condividentia ſint contradiſtincta, & oppoſita.* But you tell me, My Head, Tongue, and Hand, are diſtinct but not oppoſite. True, in themſelves they are not; but if once brought into a diſtinction, I think they would. Should I ask you, did you write your Letter to me with your Tongue or Hand? And you Anſwer not with my Tongue but with my Hand; I think they would be put in oppoſition. But away with this prattle; I am out of my faculty,

and

and will not in this conteſt with you. What is a Dunce to a Doctor?

Your next Diſcourſe is to little purpoſe; fain would you eſtabliſh your tripartite Covenant; and therefore ſhew me firſt a Covenant betwixt God and *Abraham*, which was bipartite; then comes in his Seed with him, and this muſt needs make it tripartite.

There was a Covenant betwixt God the Father and Chriſt; and after that a Covenant taking in all his Seed, called the Covenant of Grace; doth that make it tripartite? Are not Chriſt and Believers conſidered but as one Party? This notion vaniſhing, all your over ſubtle diſtinctions of *thou*, and *ye*, and *you*, and *thy Seed*, vaniſh with it. I muſt ſtill ſay you are ſingular, and I hope too modeſt to think that Wiſdom was born with you. I have told you in what ſenſe I allow a diſtinction betwixt *Abraham*, and *Iſhmael*, *Iſaac*, and all that were to come; they were diſtinct perſons, but one party *Rep.*

in

in Covenant, and all to be ſigned with Circumciſion. And you adventure far without guide or warrant, in affirming *Abraham* to repreſent only the Carnal Seed: for Believers are as often called *Abraham*'s Children, as *Iſaac*'s. I ſay, all theſe forementioned terms ſignifie no more but *Abraham* and all his, whether preſent or future, as one party with him; and it is not my notion but yours that makes the Scripture unintelligible: For both *Iſhmael* and *Iſaac* were *Abraham*'s Seed, and both obliged to be Circumciſed. And though *Iſaac* in the manner of his birth was the figure or repreſentative of the Spiritual Seed; yet this makes not him a third party no more than it did *Abraham* whoſe Children the Spiritual Seed are as often called as they are *Iſaac*'s.

Your next Paragraph is remarkable, and ſeems to me the giving up of your cauſe for loſt. You there tax me for a bold abuſe, in ſaying, 'That you intimate that Bap-'tiſm is immediately *intended* in the

'9.

'9. Verſe of *Gen.* 17. Mark your own word; not *inſtituted* but *intended.* Whence I argue; If Baptiſm be neither there inſtituted, nor intended; if it be neither in the Letter, nor *intention* of that Text; it is not there *at all.* And all the noiſe you have made about it, is but a beating of the Air. And whereas you do alſo tell me, the ſenſe is *indeterminate* and *general.* Here you leave me a fair Field: for whether the ſenſe be determinate or no, I appeal to all the rational World to determine: except you will dare to interrupt the Spirit of God in a continued Speech, break the ſeries of his Diſcourſe, put a ſtop where you pleaſe, before he hath ſpoken out; and catch one part before the other which determines the ſenſe be uttered; (as I told you in my laſt) and then call it indeterminate and general. But this is not to be endured among men; you your ſelf would not ſuffer it to be thus handled. Much leſs will God ſuffer it. Doth not God in the ſame breath, (as I may ſay) determine

termine the ſenſe, and tell you wherein the Covenant is to be kept; namely in *Circumciſion*? Do not theſe Words immediately follow the former, *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep, &c. Every Man-child among ye ſhall be Circumciſed?* And do they not determine the ſenſe? What a liberty do you take not only to interpret this Text, but rend one part from another, and put periods where you pleaſe? But why do I beat the buſh, when the Bird is fled? Baptiſm it ſeems, is neither in the Letter, nor intention of *Gen.* 17. 9. And if ſo, the Diſpute is ended; and we are where we were before. Had there been *a* ſign, or *the* ſign in the 9. Verſe, diſtinct from that in the 10. the one Baptiſm, the other Circumciſion; *Iſhmael* the ſubject of the latter, as a repreſentative of the Carnal Seed; and *Iſaac* of the former, as a figure of the Spiritual: (as your former Diſcourſes ran) then *Iſaac* muſt have been Baptized; or elſe you make him a ſtrange Figure. But now you yield,

yield, he was neither Baptized in his own perſon, nor Baptiſm ſo much as *intended* in the 9. Verſe. And what more ſatisfaction can I expect from you? you may diſtinguiſh the *thou*, and *ye*, and *you*, *and thy Seed after thee*, as ſubtilly as you can.

But though you acknowledge Baptiſm is not the *immediate* ſenſe of Verſe 9. Yet it may be you will tell me, it is the *remote* ſenſe. Yes ſure, remote enough, and out of the ken of all men beſides your ſelf. But I pray you, Where do you find this *remote* ſenſe, and what is the *immediate* ſenſe, if neither Circumciſion nor Baptiſm be there? The Covenant it ſeems according to this reckoning, may be kept without any ſign; which yet you would not allow in your former Papers. But pray tell me, How was *Abraham* and his to keep it in the *general indeterminate* ſenſe, which is neither in the one or the other ſign? I am afraid this will puzle you, if not you, it doth ſuch a ſoft Head as mine. Did not you

tell

tell me in your laſt; The Covenant muſt be kept in *ſome ſign*; and yet here it may be kept *without any*? *Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee*, that is *in the ſign of it*: But that muſt not be underſtood, ſay you, in any *particular* or *determinate* ſenſe, but *in general* only: for though Baptiſm is *intended*; yet it is not *immediately* intended, but *remotely* only. But you may diſtinguiſh as you pleaſe; Baptiſm, I am ſure, is not to be found in the *expreſs* Words of the Text, and you your ſelf do now acknowledg, it is not in the *immediate* ſenſe; and I have proved that the ſenſe cannot be *general*, and *indeterminate*: what need any more ado then to darken Counſel thus, by Words without knowledge? there ſeemed once *a* ſign, or *the* ſign in the 9. Verſe, diſtinct from that in the 10. but now it is vaniſht, and there is no ſign there at all, only in a *general*, *indeterminate*, and *remote ſenſe*, that is in *no* ſenſe. So that *Abraham* and his, according to your interpretation,

terpretation, were obliged to keep the Covenant in a *nonſenſe* way.

Your next Paragraph runs you into as bad a ſlough as the former. You ſay you thought to have diſmiſt the point; but that ſomething came into your mind. It had been well you had kept to your firſt intention, and have let that objection of mine that came to your mind, alone, as you have done many others. You had aſſerted that *Abraham* ſtood for the Carnal Seed. It ſeems I had objected, *Rom.* 4. *That he received Circumciſion as a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of Faith*; and therefore ſtood for the Spiritual Seed as well as *Iſaac*. This pinches, and to clear your ſelf of this troubleſome objection, you return two things: Firſt, That the reward was perſonal, and earthly: for ſo is the ſenſe of what you ſay. Secondly, That it was given him *for* his believing of the Promiſe to him (ſo improbable, ſo unlikely, and in nature ſo impoſſible) *viz.* *That he ſhould have Seed as the Stars.*

Sir

Sir, I am almoſt as much amazed at your Expoſition of *Rom.* 4. as at that of *Gen.* 17. Did *Abraham* repreſent none in this, or only the Carnal Seed. And was the reward only the Land of *Canaan*; and that reward too *for* his believing a thing ſo improbable? Whither will not men run when left to the guidance of their own Reaſon and Fancy? Look again I beſeech you on the Text, *Rom.* 4. 11. Was it not that he might be the Father of all them that *believe*? And are all them that *believe*, the *Carnal Seed*, for whom he ſtood? And is it not added, Verſe 23. *That it was not written for his ſake alone* (as you interpret, and can do no other, if you make him ſtand only for the Carnal Seed) *but for us alſo*? And was the Land of *Canaan* the only reward of his Faith? or did he not look for another reward in Heaven, *Heb.* 11. 10. And was this reward given him *for* his believing a thing ſo improbable, and in nature ſo impoſſible? your meaning may be good, but your

your expreſſions ſound harſh, and diſſonant to *Rom.* 4. 4. the reward not being of Debt but of Grace; not for the *dignity*, or the *Act* of his Faith, but from Grace.

All that follows to the cloſe, is a meer ſtrife about Words formerly cenſured by me, and induſtriouſly vindicated by you, with ſome new marks of Reproach with which you brand me: And finding nothing in it but that which you nauſeate, and call a brabling buſineſs, I paſs it over, being loth to give you more *Tongue* than needs muſt.

You ſhut up with a challenge of a Perſonal Diſpute at *Totnes*; and a Menace of printing your part; leaving me to do with mine as I pleaſe.

As to your Challenge, I dare not anſwer it; not only becauſe I acknowledg you much my ſuperior, and to wear a long Sword, compared with my Dagger. I am as you have repreſented me, and much more; you a man of renown. And therefore if you offer my reputation

putation as a Victim to your glory, it will not be thereby much illuſtrated: but beſides, the Law allows no ſuch Meetings; and I and my Friends are ſecluſe, and incapable of appearing on ſuch a ſcore. I perceive you are well acquainted with *Æſop's Fables*; I therefore recommend to you, that of the Rat and the Frog attempting to go over the Water in conjunction. As it fared with them, ſo it may with us in ſuch a congreſs.

As for publiſhing your Arguments I cannot oppoſe you; but in Juſtice I think you are bound to publiſh all mine with them; elſe you will be

In vacuo ſolus Seſſor Plauſorq; Theatro.

Triumphing and applauding all alone, no Adverſary being with you on the Stage, which is an eaſie triumph.

To conclude, I think the World will be but little enlightned by ſuch a Diſcourſe of yours, publiſhed in your own vindication. Sure I am, neither

neither the Argument you mannage, or the Adverſary you have choſen, can add one Grain to your Reputation. But do as you pleaſe, and I will do what I ought, and as far as I can, to vindicate Truth; retaining ſtill that Honour which is due to your Perſon and Parts from,

SIR,

Dartm. Jan. 19. 1682.

Your Affectionate Friend and Servant

Philip Cary.

FINIS